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ABSTRACT

This study elaborates a theoretical rationale for interracial dyad networks as a structural form of social capital that can facilitate interracial social capital formation and produce positive-sum outcomes across races. A purposeful sample of extreme cases of social capital developed between matched interracial pairs comprised of influential business and community leaders was used to obtain rich information on the interracial social capital formation phenomenon. The dyad interrelations were analyzed using a qualitative, phenomenological, multiple-case study approach. The study findings revealed a social capital formation process surrounding both the cultivation of interracial dyadic friendships and bridging networks across races, and specific related outcomes produced. Dyadic networks, social currency, interracial friendships, and network expansion were found to link quantifiable measures of social capital and related outcomes that provide both individual and social value.

This study contributes to the knowledge base of both intergroup contact and social capital theories and offers a basis for the application of Blau’s (1977) diversity opportunity network theory. The results can be used towards building social capital in multi-cultural communities, community and economic development, race relations, and professional training that incorporates diversity initiatives. Programs seeking to foster leadership through deliberate intercultural competencies, ethnic and cultural sensitivity, diverse collaboration, and collective creativity competencies can also benefit from the findings. Future research is recommended to compare unsuccessful and/or mediocre
outcomes of interracial contact and social capital formation to the results of this current study.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Rampant segregation and the lack of social relations across races are structural factors that reinforce the persistence of discrimination and segregation practices against people of color (Massey & Denton, 1999; Putnam, 2007). Both impact the ability of many people of color to effectively participate in the U.S. economic mainstream. Such exclusionary discrimination practices often prevent people of color from equal forms of education and economic access as compared to Whites (Massey & Denton, 1993). These practices coupled with the nation’s rapid multi-racial demographic growth (Toosi, 2002) makes it difficult for people who are different from each other to cultivate the social relations needed to develop social capital across races (Allport, 1955/1979). To further complicate matters, segregation in the U.S. is increasingly growing in degree and complexity (Orfield & Lee, 2006) making opportunities for interracial social relations a even more difficult challenge. These converging forces may have devastating consequences to the future economic foundation of this diverse nation.

The term social capital commonly refers to the social relations that facilitate collective action and that produce beneficial social outcomes to society (Coleman, 1988; Lin, 2001; Putnam, 2000). Coleman suggested that social outcomes manifested in positive relations among people often transform into beneficial human and economic forms of capital. For this reason, segregation and the social distance between Whites and people of color may be what hinders the ability of these different groups from forming the social relations needed to build social capital across racial lines. Orfield and Lee
(2006) contend that segregation is rarely about race or ethnicity, rather, it refers to concentrated poverty, education inequality, and pockets of unemployment. It is possible that these under-served human and economic social outcomes may also stem from ineffective uses of cross-race social capital.

Increased interracial social contact could potentially reduce the separation between races and facilitate building social capital across races, a feat which has the potential to turn this nation’s growing racial diversity into a national asset (Putnam, 2007). This first chapter introduces the background of this national problem; establishes the research problem statement; and provides theoretical perspectives, research questions, glossary of terms, and chapter summary. Finally, a brief description of the remaining chapters is presented.

Background of the Problem

The United States is becoming more racially diverse due to the rapid growth of Hispanic, African-American, Asian, and immigrant populations. These changing demographics are occurring faster than ever, and by 2050, these populations will comprise over 50% of the total U.S. population. This growing racially diverse character of the U.S. will have an overarching reality in shaping the future of America’s civic, social, and economic life. Recent trends suggest that the U.S. workforce is also growing more racially diverse (Toosi, 2002). By 2028, there will be 19 million more jobs than workers who are adequately prepared to fill them, and roughly 40% of the people available to take these jobs will be people of color (Business-Higher Education Forum, 2002).
The speed of diverse growth in the U.S. makes these racially divisive outcomes a potential threat to the future social capital of the nation (Putnam, 2007). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, by the year 2050, African-American and Hispanic populations will constitute nearly 47% of the total U.S. population, shown in Table 1.1. This growth rate will cause significant changes in the racial-ethnic composition of the U.S. population. For example, from 1990 to 2003, the Hispanic population grew faster than the U.S. population as a whole, 58% to 41.3 million, making Hispanics 13.9% of the population. By 2050, their number is projected to increase 188% to 102.6 million, making them 24% of the population (Anderson, 2003). Intermarriage with the larger population of non-Hispanic Whites has increased, as has Hispanic presence at all school levels, the workforce, and communities. The number of Whites increased by only 3%, whereas, the number of people of color increased by 43%. The percentage of Americans who are White decreased from 76% in 1990 to 69% in 2000. Significant growth also occurred among African Americans (16%) and American Indians (15%) (Anderson, 2003; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2004).

Such growth is making some states and communities more racially and ethnically diverse (Anderson, 2003). In North Carolina, for example, the Hispanic population increased by almost 400%. Arkansas and Georgia experience growth among Hispanics of at least 300%. Eight states experienced growth between 150 and 300%. Half of the states were above the national rate of growth for African Americans, which was 16%. Ten states increased by more than 30%. States with low numbers of African Americans saw significant increases in that population.
The Asian-American population increased by 50% nationally between 1990 and 2000, and the largest percentage increases in this population occurred primarily in states with small numbers of Asian-American in 1990. By 2000, Whites were in the majority in New Mexico and California, at 55% and 53%, respectively. The growth among people of color in Texas made the state nearly half White in 2000. According to Anderson (2003), significant growth in the percentage of people of color in New York, Maryland, and Louisiana made Whites 38% of the population in all three states.

Table 1.1

2000 Census Racial Breakdown and Projected Breakdowns of Racial Groups for 2050, by Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2000 Census</th>
<th>2050 Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Americans</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Americans</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Americans</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Figures do not add up to 100% due to overlap between groups and individuals who do not fit into any of the categories. From Bureau of the Census 2001: P-20-535; Day 1996.

While these trends suggest a crucial need to capitalize on the growing diversity talent pool, racial and ethnic diversity typically have not been understood or utilized by the nation as assets or resources that lead to community, educational, or economic gains. Factors that create the underutilization of human potential, particularly for people of color, include discrimination, differential educational opportunities among individuals
and/or groups, inappropriate training for the market, and a division in the distribution of technological knowledge (Freeman, 2004).

The vast majority of talent and resources of under-privileged people of color who make up the growth trends continue to go unrecognized and underutilized (Business-Higher Education Forum, 2002). While a large portion of the jobs will demand skills and knowledge far beyond those of a high school graduate, people of color who are considered *native* lag behind Whites in earning undergraduate degrees in a number of disciplines and in their training and educational credentials (Business-Higher Education Forum, 2002).

While this demographic landscape is rapidly growing, research shows little or no increase in people of color in higher education in proportion to their population growth rate. This underrepresentation of students of color in higher education, according to King (1993), limits the presence of talented African Americans and Latinos in the teaching profession, which continues to be a serious problem in the U.S. educational system and with the U.S. African-American and Latino communities. Representation of minority faculty and administrators constitute a significantly small number of higher education professionals on college campuses (Eaton, 1988). Without immediate action to correct inequities in education, tomorrow’s workforce will be neither ready to meet the challenges of a knowledge-intensive workplace nor able to take advantage of the vast opportunities that our economy will offer (Business-Higher Education Forum, 2002). Understanding how to bridge the social and spatial divides between the races may help to recruit and retain students of color and enhance the performance of all students.
The biography of Vivian Thomas (1998), for example, displays a personal example of potential missed opportunities when this nation underutilizes the talent pool of its people of color. In 1930, Vivian Thomas, an African American unable to complete college after losing his seven-year savings from the stock market crash, took a job as a lab assistant, with a job classification of janitor, working for Dr. Blalock, a young cardiac surgeon at that time. With only a high school diploma, Thomas helped develop the procedure, tested the surgery, and designed the instruments that contributed to the discovery of the renowned Blue Baby Syndrome operation. Today, Thomas’ contribution in this area saves millions of lives because thousands of doctors, many trained by Thomas, administer the Blue Baby Syndrome operation. This example also demonstrates an example of interracial social capital formation that let to economic gains despite institutionalized discrimination: It [Blalock and Thomas] was a relationship that transgressed the rules, that crossed the boundaries, that subverted the hierarchy,” says Don Doyle, Professor of Southern History at Vanderbilt University. “Despite all the laws aimed at keeping the races apart, these men met as two human beings, as two scientists, as two minds” (Roth, 2003). As demonstrated by these two men, social capital formation across races can have a significant impact on the quality of all lives.

Statement of the Research Problem

Racial disparities against people of color continue to exist even as the face of the nation rapidly changes. Schultz (1961) refers to one aspect of underutilization of human potential in the early 1960s when he stated, “Human capital deteriorates when it is idle because unemployment impairs the skills that workers have acquired” (p.2-3). White privilege and race continue to be a defining characteristic of American life and they both
shape our values, beliefs, perspectives, and the quality of life for those who are less privileged.

Some scholars have argued that people of color experience the negative consequences of disparities in two important areas: (a) gaining access to people in the community and in organizations who can facilitate their acceptance into organization networks, and (b) gaining access to developmental relationships providing care-enhancing and psychosocial support (Cianni & Romberger, 1995; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Ibarra, 1992). Discrimination like unemployment blocks people of color from access to resources and social connections needed to improve the negative conditions these disparities perpetuate. Dominant group discrimination impedes both Whites and people of color from having the social access to each other, which is needed to develop social capital across racial lines. Discrimination de facto and de jure, designed to block people of color from participating and benefiting from mainstream or homogenous social capital development, contributes to the underdevelopment of interracial social capital skills. More importantly, it also blocks opportunities for Whites to develop social relations with people of color to form social capital across diversity lines (Blau, 1977; Blau & Schwartz, 1984; Weaver, 2007). Since over 80% of educators are White, enhancing the social relations between Whites and people of color could help to increase the success and opportunities for less privileged groups.

While heterogeneous collective action across diversity lines may not be a common practice in mainstream economic development, examples of effective cross-racial collaboration efforts such as the Freedom Rides (Arsenault, 2006) and the formation of NAACP (Ovington, 1998) are examples of social capital formed across
racial lines. Both examples were driven by the goal to remove clear and visible barriers to equal participation of all groups. Today, these legal barriers have been removed, making initiatives to form cross-racial alliances unnecessary.

Heterogeneous social capital may be the access needed to help overcome racial divides and to build multi-cultural diversity as a national asset. How this nation responds to the challenge of its increasing diversity will shape both the national life and America’s role in the global economy for decades to come. Determining the practical competencies needed in building heterogeneous social capital is the possible outcome of this research. Increasing heterogeneous social capital may help less privileged individuals develop social capital competency allowing them to turn them into other forms of capital such as economic and human capital.

If positive and lasting outcomes are to arise from the multi-cultural character of this nation, the U.S. must overcome the barriers that prevent its diversity from becoming a national asset. Building social capital across diversity lines may provide a way to extend the benefits of social capital to all people. The purpose of this study is to examine bi-racial dyads to learn how social capital, if any, is shared and transferred across racial lines at the individual level of analysis.

Currently, little research exists on how social capital is formed across racial/ethnic diversity lines (Goddard, 2003; Putnam, 2007). This research proposal may contribute knowledge that can illuminate how social capital across racial lines is developed. Applying the dimensions of social capital theory to improving race relations may help practitioners understand how to bridge the racial differences between Whites and people of color without the emotional trappings of race-based accusations. Since trust is viewed
by researchers (Putnam, 2007) as the foundation of social capital, it is also possible to expand knowledge of how trust is developed across racial lines. Understanding how to bridge social relations across diversity lines may help less privileged communities begin to operate more efficiently as an important step towards building and strengthening its social capital. In doing so, the nation can begin exploring and tapping the undiscovered and underutilized talent resources of those currently considered socially disadvantaged. This coupled with the national growth of people of color populations can potentially have a positive impact on the nation’s economy.

*Explanations for Disparities*

Several explanations may explain the continued disparity between Whites and people of color. One historical explanation was legal segregation, where the lack of cross race contact resulted in segregated networks (Allport, 1955/1979). While the United States is becoming more racially heterogeneous, it remains a segregated nation (Massey & Denton, 1999). Most Americans grow up in racially homogenous areas and rarely interact with people of other races (Massey & Denton, 1999; Sigelman, Bledsoe, & Combs, 1996). This racial distance and spatial isolation tends to produce social isolation (Massey & Denton, 1993) at the group and individual level.

Such racial segregation contributes to an inability of Americans to trust individuals who are different from them (Putnam, 2007). Putnam (2000) maintains that trust may potentially be the social glue to building the relationships that are necessary to overcome these differences, which could make it one of the fundamental social assets necessary to increase the nation’s social capital (Putnam, 2000). This lack of trust between races may exist for a variety of reasons. One such reason is the threat to White
privilege by the dominant White culture and the resentment of exclusion by people of color (Blau, 1977). Understanding how trust can be developed across racial lines may potentially facilitate both individual and social capital development across diversity lines (Putnam, 2007). The absence of trust or trust in limited forms plays a key role in acquiring or exchanging social capital across marginalized groups. Trust is an important feature of social capital. Lin (1982) defines social capital as investing in social relations with expected returns in the marketplace and workplace. Combining Putnam (2007) and Lin’s ideas, lack of trust across racial ethnic diversity lines makes forming social capital difficult.

If positive and lasting outcomes are to arise from the multi-cultural character of this nation, the U.S. must overcome the barriers that prevent its diversity from becoming a national asset. Building social capital across diversity lines may provide a way to extend the benefits of social capital to all people. The purpose of this study is to examine bi-racial dyads to learn how social capital, if any, is shared and transferred across racial lines at the individual level of analysis.

Currently, little research exists on how social capital is formed across racial/ethnic diversity lines (Goddard, 2003; Putnam, 2007). This research proposal may contribute knowledge that can illuminate how social capital across racial lines is developed. Applying the dimensions of social capital theory to improving race relations may help practitioners understand how to bridge the racial differences between Whites and people of color without the emotional trappings of race-based accusations. Since trust is viewed by researchers (Putnam, 2007) as the foundation of social capital, it is also possible to expand knowledge of how trust is developed across racial lines. Understanding how to
bridge social relations across diversity lines may help less privileged communities begin to operate more efficiently as an important step towards building and strengthening its social capital. In doing so, the nation can begin exploring and tapping the undiscovered and underutilized talent resources of those currently considered socially disadvantaged. This coupled with the national growth of people of color populations can potentially have a positive impact on the nation’s economy.

In light of growing national ethnic diversity, attention must be given to ways to prevent discrimination from impairing the ability and potential of ethnically diverse individuals. If the perils of discrimination remain unaddressed, economic growth will be increasingly inequitable and upward social mobility will continue to be severely limited. Approaching discrimination through the lens of social capital might help to explain its persistence. For example, according to Portes (1998), an overabundance of bonding social capital can be negative for communities in that it can create groups that can be used to exclude others, reinforce inequalities, and limit individual freedoms.

Social Opportunity Network

One way to approach the underdeveloped interracial social capital and the abundance of homogeneous social capital is to create opportunity structures that work to transcend segregation and encourage interracial social relations (Blau, 1977; Landcare Research, 2001). Opportunity structures are social networks formed specifically to bring racially diverse people together. Various types of opportunity structures provide the means by which different groups of people will have the chance to interact. These networks serve a vital role in a community by promoting information diffusion, shared responsibility, intergroup trust, and external orientation in community behavior.
Such bridging ties provide for exchanging information and resources between different social or economic groups within a community (Warner, Hinrichs, Schneyer, & Joyce, 1999). In this case, this dissertation seeks to examine one such opportunity structure and its association with providing a bridge to social capital formation across racial lines.

Theoretical Framework

To examine opportunity networks and their connection with social capital formation across racial lines, a theoretical framework is necessary to explain the possible impact of various theories that might apply to this problem. This section provides an overview of two such theories, including intergroup contact and social capital theories.

Theoretical Perspectives on Contact Theory

Before 1954, there was little interest in studying the effects of contact on prejudice because segregation kept equal status contact between minorities and the White majority to a minimum (Weaver, 2007). This was changed by the landmark case of Brown V. Board of Education in 1954 in which the Supreme Court declared separate educational facilities discriminatory and reversed this practice by adopting civil rights legislation the following decade (Armor, 1995). Believing contact between groups increases communication and interaction which, in turn, reduces stereotypes and negative attitudes, many social scientists saw the end of de jure segregation as an opportunity to test the effects of contact on intergroup behavior and attitudes (Allport, 1955/1979; Forbes, 1997). During the next decades, there were hundreds of studies of contact in communities, organizations, and schools and among ethnic groups establishing contact.

Over the past few decades, a great deal of research has focused on understanding
prejudice, with hopes of illuminating how we might reduce intergroup conflict. One of
the primary theories regarding prejudice reduction is the contact hypothesis (Allport,
1955/1979; Pettigrew, 1998). The underlying assumption of the theory is that prejudice
stems from a lack of knowledge and exposure to different groups. Thus, increased
interaction between members of different groups should allow individuals to gain
information about other groups and lead to reduced hostility and ethnic prejudice between
the two groups (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Allport (1955/1979) defines
ethnic prejudice as an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization that
may be felt or expressed and may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an
individual because he/she is a member of that group. Allort’s theory maintained that the
more contact between groups, the more the group members can learn about their
similarities, rather than their differences, and negate negative beliefs and feelings, thereby
reducing prejudice.

Based on the research of Allport (1955/1979), reduced prejudice would result
when four features of the contact situation are present: (a) equal status between the
groups in the situation; (b) common goals; (c) intergroup cooperation; and (d) support of
authorities, law, or custom. A more recent feature added to this theory introduced by
Pettigrew (1997) is more intimate contacts, such as close friendships, which also seem to
promote positive racial attitudes among people of color (Krackhardt, 1992; Pettigrew,
1997). The presence of these five features of contact theory have been determined to
reduce prejudice and has become the model for structured contact programs (Pettigrew &
Tropp, 2006; Stephan & Stephan, 2005).

While social contact theories may help to illuminate how racial segregation
contributes to racial discrimination, it falls short of addressing building social assets within and in between relationships across racial lines, particularly in disadvantaged communities where access to social privileges and social asset development is blocked. In other words, eliminating discrimination and segregation only reduces interracial barriers but does not provide the skills needed to form productive social relationships that generate collective actions, which ultimately benefits society. Developing such skills provides a means to improve depressed economic conditions of those less-privileged communities.

Casual interracial contact between Whites and people of color often takes place under competitive and even hostile circumstances and is not necessarily associated with positive racial attitudes. These interactions are further punctuated by power differentials associated with classist and racist beliefs. This is largely due to the demographic imbalance of the dominant culture and depends on the distribution, concentration, and proximity of the ethnic communities (Ellison & Powers, 1994; Lee & Welch, 1993).

Previous research hypothesizes that Whites’ geographic proximity to large populations of racial and ethnic individuals is thought to trigger perceptions of threat and competition with racial populations (Taylor, 1998). Basing his theory of diversity on principles of homophily, which is the tendency to interact with others similar to oneself, Blau (1977) asserts that although people may belong to diverse groups, they generally prefer to interact and network with people mostly like themselves.

Social and spatial distances between races make it difficult for people who are different to develop the social relations needed to build interracial social capital. Stephan and Stephan (1996) suggest early contact theorists believed that if people could be
brought together in work, school, recreation, or other settings under the contact
conditions, improvements in intergroup relations would ensue. This discussion continues
with a review of individual and social capital factors resulting from the interrelations that
have shown to go on to produce social capital and outcomes that may be beneficial to
eroding discrimination practices and the detriments of racial segregation.

Theoretical Perspectives on Social Capital Theory

The notion of social capital first appeared in Lyda Judson Hanifan's (1916) discussions of rural school community centers. He used the term to describe, “those tangible substances [that] count for most in the daily lives of people” (pg. 135). Hanifan was particularly concerned with the cultivation of good will, fellowship, sympathy, and social intercourse among those that “make up a social unit” (pg. 135). It took some time for the term to come into widespread usage. The idea moved into academic debates as a result of contributions from Jane Jacobs (1961) in relation to urban life and neighborliness, Pierre Bourdieu (1983) with regard to social theory, and then James S. Coleman (1988) in his discussions of the social context of education. However, it was the work of Putnam (Putnam, 2000; 1993) that launched social capital as a popular focus for research and policy discussion. Social capital has also been picked up by the World Bank (1999) as a useful organizing idea. The research conducted by the World Bank shows increasing evidence that social cohesion is critical for societies to prosper economically and for development to be sustainable (The World Bank 1999). Putnam’s use of social capita is most germane to this study because he is not only concerned with the role of social capital in economic development but also the intensity of civic engagement and in forming democratic societies (Pargal, Gilligan, & Huq, 2002).
There has been an explosion of literature over the past decade on the subject of social capital in both the theoretical and applied social science literature. Although the concept of social capital has been around for many years in different contexts (Halpern, 2005), the latest focus has now turned to ethnic diversity and social capital in the context of the changing demographics (Putnam, 2000, 2007). Theorists and researchers that range from those who vaguely define group trust and civic engagement to more complex definitions that relate to individuals developing specific kinds of relationships as resources, have conceived of the definition of social capital differently.

For Coleman (1990), social capital has no independent existence and is the structure that aids the actions of individuals within that structure. Coleman considers social capital similar to other forms of capital in that it is productive and makes outcomes possible that could not be achieved otherwise. Social capital is the property of many social structures and has influence on individuals.

While the social capital literature is spread across disciplines, the work of Coleman (1988, 1990), Putnam (2000, 2007), and Lin (1982, 2001) is used for this research because of their contributions to human capital. Social capital provides the theoretical contexts of social relations evolving from the individual level, which produce outcomes to society. According to Putman (2007), ethnic diversity and immigration are two factors that will become a valuable national asset. His projections are largely due to the significance of the rapid growth of racial ethnic populations, particularly in under-performing communities.

The potential role of social capital and networks in community development has increasing recognition, both for understanding it conceptually and for strengthening
practice (Gittell & Vidal, 1998). Tapping into the talent and building social capital in less 
privileged communities to improve their economic vitality and correspondingly, the 
vitality of this nation, has gained the attention of the theoretical and applied social 
science literature over the past decade. Putnam’s (2000) achievement in developing 
methods for measuring social capital has stimulated research showing significant 
associations between social capital and general well-being indicators, particularly the 
amount of trust and civic engagement of a community.

*Social Capital Theory and Diversity*

For the purpose of this research, *social capital* is defined as the value derived 
from social relations that produces social outcomes, which contributes to other forms of 
capital such as human, financial, and cultural capital, and that improves both social and 
individual gains in the marketplace. Loury (1977) used social capital to emphasize the 
inaccessibility of wider social ties to African Americans as one of the great injustices of 
slavery and segregation. The central theme of social capital is that capital is captured in 
social relations (Lin, 2001). Social capital, like financial capital and human capital, has 
an impact on the productivity of individuals, organizations, and communities. Coleman 
(1988) posits that social capital in the family and social capital in the community occurs 
through time and effort spent providing mental support and socially exchanging 
information and resources to effect outcomes that improve social and individual 
conditions. Mutual assistance, collective action, networks, information exchange, and 
reciprocity are all features of social capital that play a role in creating and developing 
human capital, which collectively contribute to society.

Increasing amounts of evidence suggest that high levels of social capital produce
economic benefits such as alleviating poverty, increasing income levels, reducing unemployment, providing job opportunities, and improving economic performance at the community, state, and national levels (Bourdieu, 1983; Coleman, 1988; Lin, 1982; Putnam, 2000). For example, communities with low social capital have high poverty rates (Putnam, 2000). Given the population growth, it stands to reason that if the social capital of people of color continues to be low and underutilized, then the social capital of the U.S. as a nation is threatened to eventually erode (Business-Higher Education Forum, 2002).

*Bonding social capital* refers to the social networks and alliances between people who are similar in one or more key characteristics including ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or political affiliation (Saguaro Seminar, 2000). Portes and Landolt (1996) suggest that, in the extreme, highly bonded groups may create norms that are stifling to some who feel they are unable to break away for fear of being ostracized. This has the potential to perpetuate a restrictive status quo and may reduce personal choices. Putnam (2000) states that social capital acts to lubricate the economic life of a community. He describes social capital as features of social organization that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions. Building social capital in diverse communities to improve its economic vitality has gained attention in the theoretical and applied social science literature over the past decade.

The Research Question

The proposed research draws upon the social relationship between dyad participants who participated in a *structured opportunity network* called Prism (a pseudonym). Based on intermittent proprietary surveys of the cohort participants, overall
Prism participants reported that both trust levels and social networks, which are both assets of social capital, increased between cross-race participants. What is unknown, however, is how the participant dyads went about forming social capital in their social interactions and what outcomes, if any, were produced from their coordinated actions? In addition, it is unknown how they each benefited, if at all, from social relations after they completed the one-year program.

This researcher intends to explore how social capital is formed across racial lines and addresses a central level question and two sub-level questions: (a) How do interracial dyads participating in structured racial opportunity networks form social capital? A Subsidiary question is posed: (b) What do interracial dyads identify as outcomes of participating in a program focused on bridging trust across races?

Glossary of Key Terms

The following are key terms and definitions as used for the purpose of this dissertation:

- **Bonding Networks**: social ties and alliances between people who are similar in one or more key characteristic including, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, and political affiliation (Saguaro Seminar, 2000).

- **Bridging Networks**: social ties that link people together with others across a cleavage that typically divides society like race, or class, or religion (Saguaro Seminar, 2000).

- **Community**: refers to both a set of people living in a recognized geographic area and a set of people who define themselves as part of a community.

- **Intergroup Contact**: is defined as actual face-to-face interaction between members of clearly defined groups (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).
• *Interracial Dyads*: two individuals paired across races.

• *People of Color*: groups in America who are and have been historically targeted by racism, including people of African, Asian, and Latin American descent, as well as indigenous peoples referred to as Native Americans or American Indians (Tatum, 1997).

• *Prejudice*: negative bias toward a particular group of people (Tatum, 1997).

• *Racism*: a system of advantage based on race. In the context of the United States, this system clearly operates to the advantage of Whites and to the disadvantage of people of color (Tatum, 1997; Wellman, 1977).

Chapter Summary

Understanding both the conceptual and programmatic manner in which social capital resources can be successfully navigated and developed across diversity lines has the potential to increase the formation of interracial social capital formation. Social distance between people of color and Whites presents challenges to the development of natural opportunities to form social capital across racial lines. In the past, diversity opportunity networks have served the role of bridging social distance to build trust and familiarity between cultures. Given the history of social divide, there is much to learn about the circumstances under which social capital is formed between interracial partners and networks.

Intergroup contact and social capital integrate in this research to frame the problem and purpose of this research. Further examination of the theories framing the problem is explored through a review of the empirical literature in Chapter 2.
Summary of Remaining Chapters

Chapter 2 examines the existing literature on the role of intergroup relations and the formation of social capital. Chapter 3 describes the research design and methodology used to investigate social capital formation and outcomes produced by business and community leaders who volunteered to participate in a formal community intervention program. The research findings are elaborated in Chapter 4, which examined how matched interracial parings formed social capital and the outcomes they identified and produced. Finally, Chapter 5 focuses on a discussion of the implications of the findings relative to the literature review, emerging interracial social models, significance of the findings, and study limitations.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This study examined how business and community leaders paired in an interracial dyad formed social capital during and after participating in a one-year structured interracial intervention program. The intervention program created a structured opportunity network that allowed these influential leaders to bridge physical and social distance between races over a sustained period in hopes to build cross-race relationships and intercultural sensitivity. This chapter examines the existing literature on interracial relations and the formation of social capital in the context of three racial groups: African-Americans, Latinos, and Whites. Two primary theories apply to this research: intergroup contact theory and social capital.

To support this research, the review of literature examines two concepts. First, the review examines the research, context, empirical studies, and effects of intergroup contact. Second, this chapter also examines the research, context, empirical studies, features, formation, and outcomes of social capital. This literature provides research in these two areas to help illuminate factors that may influence the formation of social capital across races and was used to guide the research, methodology, and analysis of this research. Finally, this review of the literature concludes with a summary and an introduction to Chapter 3.
Intergroup Contact Theory, Research, and Perspectives

According to Schuck (2003), America is probably the most diverse society on earth. Yet, most Americans grow up in racially homogeneous areas and rarely interact with people of other races (Blau, 1977; Massey & Denton, 1999; Sigelman et al., 1996). According to Gurin et al., (Jan 1999), they live separate lives in separate neighborhoods; attend separate schools; are very unlikely to have any sustained or serious contact with each other; and rarely share the significant events in their lives, such as weddings and funerals, or more casual aspects of their daily lives. Because of this physical distance, Americans are apt to become biased, prejudiced, and resentful of others who are different from them, which leads to stereotypical views and behaviors (Allport, 1955/1979). Lack of contact with another fosters misconceptions and mistrust on all sides and affords little or no opportunity either to disrupt the perpetuation of racial stereotypes or to experience the richness of different racial and ethnic communities (Gurin et al., Jan 1999). Gurin et al. contend that the cost of this persistent racial separation is, therefore, significant for all Americans – people of color and Whites alike.

The history of intergroup relations shows that peaceful, productive relations between groups involving mutual respect do not come naturally (Stephan & Stephan, 2005). Creating opportunities for groups to develop meaningful relationships is often required to bridge these physical and social barriers. The Intergroup Contact Theory and research, which emerged immediately after World War II and coincided with the formal civil rights movement, suggests that frequent contact between racially diverse people can help to reduce or even eliminate prejudice (Allport, 1955/1979).
Gordon W. Allport (1954/1979) is the founder of the Intergroup Contact Theory and author of *The Nature of Prejudice*, which is the foundational work for the social psychology of prejudice. Allport’s work defined the core issues that the field continues to explore, struggle with, and reconsider (Dovidio, Glick, & Rudman, 2005). He is the founder of the *cognitive approach* to prejudice, which views stereotyping and categorization as normal and inevitable byproducts of how people think. Yet, he also viewed prejudice as a fundamentally irrational hatred, born of ignorance and the ego-defensive maneuvers of people with weak personality structures. Allport conceptualized the process of categorization as occurring when, “the mind must think with the aid of categories….Once formed, categories are the basis for normal prejudgment” (p. 20). His work spawned numerous diverse approaches as *Social Identity Theory* (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), *social cognition* (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986), and *Self-Categorization Theory* (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987).

Social Identity Theory was originally developed to understand the psychological basis of intergroup discrimination and posits that a person has not one, *personal self*, but rather several selves that correspond to widening circles of group membership. Tajfel and Turner (1979) attempted to identify the *minimal* conditions that would lead members of one group to discriminate in favor of the *ingroup* to which they belonged and against another *outgroup*. They identify three variables whose contribution to the emergence of ingroup favoritism is particularly important: (a) the extent to which individuals identify with an ingroup to internalize that group membership as an aspect of their self-concept; (b) the extent to which the prevailing context provides ground for comparison between groups; and (c) the perceived relevance of the comparison group, which itself will be
shaped by the relative and absolute status of the ingroup. Individuals are likely to display favoritism when an ingroup is central to their self-definition and a given comparison is meaningful or the outcome is contestable.

Tatum (1997) suggests that stereotypes, omissions, and distortions all contribute to the development of prejudice. She defines prejudice as a preconceived judgment or opinion, usually based on limited information. Allport (1955/1979) suggests that people have a propensity to prejudice, which lies in their normal and natural tendency to form generalizations, concepts, and categories, whose content represents an oversimplification of their world of experience. Meertens and Pettigrew (1997) revealed in their study distinctions in subtle prejudices and blatant prejudices based on data derived from 3,806 respondents drawn from seven national probability samples of four Western European nations. Likert scales were used to measure blatant and subtle prejudice. The results of their study showed that those demonstrating blatant prejudices are prone to reject nominal remedies as compared to those demonstrating subtle prejudices and willing to seek workable remedies. This is consistent with Allport (1955/1979), as he suggests prejudgments become prejudices only if they are not reversible when exposed to new knowledge.

Allport concluded that although bias may be pro as well as con, ethnic prejudice is mostly negative. In the case of ethnic bias, there is little attention paid to individual differences and for this reason, Allport defines prejudice as:

Ethnic prejudice is an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole or toward an individual because he is a member of that group (p. 9).
Allport goes on to suggest that the net effect of prejudice is to place the object of prejudice at some disadvantage not merited by his own misconduct or actions. He suggests that once separatism exists, the ground is laid for all sorts of psychological elaborations. People who stay separate have few channels of communication. Even more important is that separateness may lead to genuine conflicts of interests as well as to many imaginary conflicts.

The *Intergroup Contact Hypothesis* developed by Allport (1955/1979) indicates that interracial group contact should have a positive effect in reducing prejudice if the following four conditions exist: a) cooperation among the groups; b) a common goal; c) equal status of groups during contact; and d) the support of authority, custom, or law. The importance of these conditions in intergroup relations is based on the premise that contacts that bring knowledge, acquaintance, and cooperative interdependence in pursuit of common goals are likely to engender sounder beliefs concerning groups that are different and, for this reason, contribute to the reduction of prejudice. The underlying assumption of the theory is that prejudice stems from a lack of knowledge and exposure to different groups. As such, increased interaction between members of different groups should allow individuals to gain information about other groups and lead to a reduction in hostility and prejudice between the two groups (Brewer & Gaertner, 1998). The more the contact between groups, the more the group members can learn about their similarities.

Since Allport’s theory, other factors have been introduced as important for the facilitation of intergroup contact. Two are especially noteworthy: *intimacy* and *intergroup friendships*. The first refers to the opportunity for personal intimate interaction between the individual group members, which allows for self-disclosure and social
comparison (Brewer & Miller, 1984). Through the sharing of intimate information, trust
and familiarity are encouraged, and individuals are more likely to overcome perceived
differences and see more similarity between groups. Second, the formation of friendships
(Pettigrew, 1997) is a critical contributor to positive change in prejudice that emerges
from intergroup contact. Providing an opportunity for contact where intimacy and
friendships emerge can help increase the effectiveness of intergroup contact in reducing
prejudice.

Pettigrew (1997) updated the Intergroup Contact Hypothesis by adding the fifth
ingredient—friendship potential. Pettigrew tested the Intergroup Contact Hypothesis with
self-reports of 3,806 survey respondents in seven 1988 national probability samples from
France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, and West Germany. With seven key variables
controlled, the hypothesis is confirmed, especially for intergroup friendships and affective
prejudice. Non-recursive models indicate that the predicted friends-to-less-prejudice
causal path is larger than the prejudice to-fewer-intergroup-friends path. Based on this
study, three mediating processes are proposed to explain the generalized affects: empathy
and identification with the out-group and reappraisal of the in-group. Pettigrew concludes
that a situation's friendship potential is indicated as an essential condition for optimal
intergroup contact.

Intergroup Meta Analysis

Since Allport’s (1955/1979) formulation of intergroup contact theory, which was
initially over fifty-years ago, researchers and practitioners have speculated about the
potential for intergroup contact to reduce intergroup prejudice. Pettigrew and Tropp’s
(2006) meta analysis developed to determine the overall relationship between intergroup
contact and prejudice is currently the most comprehensive study on intergroup contact. The report included 515 individual studies with 713 independent samples and 1,383 non-independent tests. This meta analysis includes contact studies from a variety of research methods and procedures, including archival research, field studies, laboratory experiments, and surveys. The studies also included a variety of disciplines and contexts that applied to a host of social issues ranging from the racial desegregation of schools and the resolution of ethno political conflicts, to explaining regional differences in prejudice, as well as the educational mainstreaming of physically and mentally disabled children (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

Three criteria were used for the meta-analysis that included: (a) only those empirical studies in which intergroup contact acts as the independent variable and intergroup prejudice as the dependant variable; (b) only research that involved contact between members of discrete groups; and (c) the intergroup interaction must be observed directly, reported by participants, or occur in focused, long-term situations where direct contact is unavoidable. The meta-analysis also used a global indicator of Allport’s conditions: structured programs designed to achieve optimal conditions. This global indicator was used to determine whether including this indicator in the contact situation is necessary to produce positive intergroup outcomes and whether it typically enhances the positive effects of contact. Checking for the consistency of these effects, the study compared the results to the full sample and subsets of cases that either did or did not involve racial and ethnic contact.

The results of the meta-analysis also suggested that contact theory, devised originally for racial and ethnic encounters, could be extended to other groups and context
situations. The global indicator used for the study demonstrated that contact under the optimum *structured conditions* typically lead to even greater reduction in prejudice than *non-structured programs*, although they are not essential for prejudice reduction. Based on this study, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) believe there is little need to demonstrate further contact’s general ability to lessen prejudice. They also suggest that contact effects typically generalize to the entire outgroup and emerge across a broad range of outgroup targets and contact settings.

Their results conclusively showed that *intergroup contact* could promote reduction in *intergroup prejudice*. Intergroup contact theory stands as a general social physiology theory and not as a theory designed simply for the special case of racial and ethnic contact. Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) contend that continued advances in understanding intergroup contact require more extensive longitudinal research. Although longitudinal studies are rare, the few that exist have shown the persistence of the prejudice reduction achieved by contact (Levin, Laar, & Sidanius, 2003).

Another important factor was *participant selection*, which represented a potential threat to the validity because those programs that provided participants with choice as to whether to engage in the intergroup contact should reveal larger effect sizes than do those that provided no such choice. In other words, prejudiced people may avoid, and tolerant people may seek, contact with outgroups. This suggests those with the propensity towards reducing prejudice would have a higher chance of doing so given sufficient contact. The negative link between contact and prejudice may largely reflect the avoidance of contact by prejudiced people. A potential participant selection bias could limit the interpretation of many studies of intergroup contact (Pettigrew, 1998). This area of concern pertaining
to validity noted in Pettigrew and Tropp’s (2006) meta-analysis was developed in the study as the *causal sequence problem*, which examined the participant’s choice to engage in contact. The key finding of this test of the meta-analysis is that the studies that allow the participant selection bias to operate do not typically yield the larger effect sizes that would be predicted by participant selection bias. Other research (Herek & Capitanio, 1996) methods reveal that prejudice people do avoid intergroup contact. However, the path from contact to reduced prejudice is generally much stronger. The correlation between choice and effect size on the research quality is different when participants have (a) no choice, (b) some choice, and (c) full choice. Based on this correlation test, the meta analysis concentrated on intergroup situations that severely limit choice. This helped to eliminate the possibility of initial attitudes leading to differential contact, which provides a clear indication of the causal relationship between intergroup contact and prejudice.

*Learning Education Outcomes*

Since *Grutter v. Bollinger* ("Grutter v. Bollinger, et. al. 137 F. Supp.2d 821 (E.D. Mich.201), rev’d, 288 F.3d 732 ", 6th Cir. 2002), the Supreme Court has recognized the critical role that education can play in bridging the racial divide. Based on Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, and Gurin’s (2002) higher education study, the consequences of racial separation in education are enormous. The study used a longitudinal Michigan Student Survey (MSS) database including 1,129 White students, 187 African-American students, and 266 Asian-American students. At the time the MSS was conducted, 92 % of White students and 52 % of African-American students came to the University of Michigan from segregated communities. The study also included a national sample of 11,383
college students from 184 institutions who were surveyed upon entering college in 1985 and again four years later.

According to the MSS study, the results show strong evidence for intergroup contact or diversity on learning outcomes. Students who had experienced the most diversity in classroom settings and in informal interactions with peers showed the greatest engagement in active thinking processes, growth in intellectual engagement and motivation, and growth in intellectual and academic skills. Nearly every American child between the ages of six and sixteen who attend school have no significant opportunity for contact with students of different racial and ethnic groups. Considering this, the results strongly support the central role of higher education in helping students to become active citizens and participants in a pluralistic democracy. Students who experienced diversity in classroom settings and in informal interactions showed the most engagement in various forms of citizenship and the most engagement with people from different races/cultures. They were also the most likely to acknowledge that group differences are compatible with the interests of the broader community.

Finally, diversity experiences during college had impressive effects on the extent to which graduates in the national study were living racially or ethnically integrated lives in the post-college world. Students who had taken the most diversity courses and had interacted the most with diverse peers during college had the most cross-racial interactions five years after leaving college. This confirms that the long-term pattern of segregation noted by many social scientists can be broken by diversity experiences during college.
Researchers often use Allport’s conditions as a means to explain conditions that impact program results. For example, research was conducted on the effects of social distance at a midsize state university that experienced significant increases in its minority population base; specifically, a 50% increase in Black student enrollments, and a 35% and 38% increase for Asian and Hispanic student populations (Odell, Korgen, & Wang, 2005). Five hundred fifty-six students completed a survey that measured determinants of social distance. A cross-tabulation and chi-square tests determined the level of distance related to: GPA, residential status, year in school, racial issues, courses taken, social class, cross-racial friendship before school, and cross-racial friendships made during school. The results showed that students, in general, do not reduce their level of social distance as they progress through the university. The smaller social distance was found between Whites and Hispanics, as compared to African-Americans, which confirmed results of previous research (Allport, 1955/1979; Bobo & Zubrinsky, 1996). The results unique to this study showed that the only analyzed variable, which significantly related to social distance, was cross-racial friendships made before or during college.

Using Allport’s (1955/1979) conditions, Odell et al. (2005) concluded the study on the effects of social distance with an explanation for possible reasons the university and the students failed to reduce the social distance between the non-White students and White students. They observed that the University had not made clear efforts to establish Allport’s optimum conditions a, b, and e: cooperation among the groups, a common goal, and friendship potential. Consequently, they suggest that the friendships that had been created on campus were developed without programming designed to create opportunities to bridge such relationships. The University also had not established programs to
encourage cooperation or the clear sense of common goals among different racial groups on the campus.

Higher Education: Contact and Acquaintance Programs

Most intergroup dialogue higher education programs involve a series of face-to-face discussions and experiential exercises among member of two groups, facilitated by trainers. There have been empirical studies of dialogue groups conducted at the University of Michigan. Evaluation data indicate that this program has a number of positive effects on intergroup relations such as changing intergroup attitudes and creating a better understanding of discrimination and its causes (Gurin et al., Jan 1999; Lopez, Gurin, & Nagda, 1998; Patricia, Peng, Lopez, & Nagda, 1999). In these studies, the Michigan State’s longitudinal field study involved two groups of students who were surveyed at time of entrance to the university, again at the end of the term when the participants took the initial course, and four years later in their senior year. The two groups of students are those who elected the first course in the IGR Program, and a control sample of non-participants matched one for one on gender; race/ethnicity; in-state vs. out-of-state, pre-college residency; and campus residency.

The control students were drawn from a larger, comprehensive study of the class that entered the University of Michigan in 1990. All of the course participants were also part of the Michigan Study sample. Thus, both the participants and control students had baseline measures that enabled the control for self-selection in several analyses below. Altogether, 174 students, 87 participants, and 87 non-participants were in the first-year study. In the senior year, students were mailed two questionnaires, one from the IGR program and the second from the Michigan Study. Eighty one percent of the sample (140
students) completed at least one of the surveys in their senior year; 70 % (122 students) completed both senior-year surveys. The data analyzed here comes primarily from the two senior year surveys, with some responses from the entrance survey used as controls for self-selection.

There has been a wide range of programs to improve intergroup relations among racial, ethnic, religious, cultural, and other types of groups since the 1970s and 1980s (Stephan & Stephan, 2005). Most of the programs attempt to implement the optimum conditions Allport (1955/1979) describes by which face-to-face contact results in positive intergroup relations. Multicultural education, diversity training, and intergroup dialogues are three direct approaches employed by many to reduce prejudice, while cooperative learning groups represent an indirect approach.

One of the primary goals of multicultural education or formal educational models is to improve intergroup relations by helping students to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to participate in the social, civic, and cultural life of a diverse society. Research studies have been conducted on multicultural education on four populations: students in primary and secondary schools, graduate students in counseling, preservice teachers, and undergraduate students. The results of these studies show that multicultural education programs have predominantly, but not uniformly, positive outcomes (Stephan & Stephan, 2005).

Diversity group training programs were first created for use in the US military (Transik & Driskill, 1977), but later diversity training and diversity initiatives became popular in business organizations. Typically, diversity-training programs attempt to increase the participants’ awareness of dissimilarities among racial, ethnic, and cultural
groups and encourages them to value these differences. Although many assessments of diversity programs have been conducted, only a small number of studies have been published on the effects of diversity training on intergroup relations. Based on these studies, it appears that diversity-training programs are less successful with members of the dominant group than with members of target minority groups. Additionally, short programs appear to be less successful than longer programs (Stephan & Stephan, 2004).

One of the most popular types of indirect programs relies on cooperative learning techniques. Cooperative learning usually consists of placing students in small learning groups in which the task and reward structure require face-to-face interaction in which students are interdependent. This means, the students can only meet their goals through the success of the group. Studies of the effects of cooperative learning groups are so numerous that they have been subjected to meta-analyses (Stephan & Stephan, 2005). One such meta-analysis (Johnson & Johnson, 2000) found that cooperation produced more cross-racial friendships than competition or individualist learning. In general, the findings have been that cooperative learning generally had more positive effects on intergroup relations such as increased intergroup friendships than traditional competitive or individual learning (Slavin, 1995).

A meta-analysis of types of intergroup relations programs was conducted by Stephan, Renfro, and Stephan (2004). Fifty-eight articles containing quantitative data were examined, and dependant variables that did not measure intergroup relations attitudes or behaviors were removed. Most of the programs took place in educational institutions, but some were conducted in work and recreational settings. The results of the
meta-analysis indicated that these programs were generally effective, although the size was relatively modest. These programs appeared also to be equally effective with majority and minority group members. It appears that the manner in which the programs were conducted may be more important than the specific techniques that were employed (Stephan & Stephan, 2005).

Contact Experiences Between Races

According to some researchers (Ellison & Powers, 1994; Rodriquez, Rodriquez, & Rodriquez, 2003; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005), the positive interaction among members of both racial minority and majority groups are not the same. Tropp and Pettigrew contend that research on interracial contact has tended to neglect the perspectives of racial minority groups. Tropp’s (2007) study shows that intergroup contact is less effective for minority than for majority group members (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005) and that minority group member’s experiences during an intergroup interaction are quite different than a majority group member’s experience (Shelton, Richeson, & Salvatore, 2005). For years, researchers have suggested (Bennett, 1973; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005) that racial minority groups are more likely to come into contact with members of the racial majority group and that the contact should have less an effect on Blacks than it does for White Americans. A number of studies show that Black and White views of interracial relations differ greatly (Gallup Organization, 2001). For example, one in four White Americans – and one in ten Black Americans – believe that Blacks are treated the same as Whites in the United States. In this same survey, more than eight out of ten Whites said that Black children had as good a chance as White children to get a good education in their local community.
Shelton et al. (Shelton et al., 2005) conducted a study to examine the extent to which ethnic minorities’ expectancies about being the target of prejudice impact affective and behavioral outcomes during dyadic interethnic interactions. The study accounted for the consequences of ethnic minorities’ expectations about prejudice not only for their own experiences but also for their White partner’s experiences. In doing so, this research takes a broader view of the social interaction process by considering the implications of ethnic minorities’ expectancies about being the target of prejudice for both individuals in the interaction. This approach has been largely neglected in previous research on interethnic contact.

Based on Shelton et al. findings, Whites and ethnic minorities can participate in the same interaction but walk away with vastly different experiences. The results also suggest that because of ethnic minorities’ expectations about how the dominant group may treat them, Whites may leave the interaction feeling comfortable about interethnic interactions, or at least comfortable that particular outgroup member, whereas ethnic minorities may leave feeling less comfortable about such interactions. Compensatory strategies often motivated to dispel the negative expectation that their partners hold, or at least expectations that they think their partner holds about their group, were found to be used by ethnic minorities.

Effects of Contact Between Races

Weaver (2007) examined the effects of contact on the prejudice between Hispanics and non-Whites in the United States. A survey containing six items about contacts with ethnic groups was included on the 2000 General Social Survey. This study followed the common practice Jackman (1994) suggests measures indirect manifestations
of prejudice rather than prejudice itself. Four items were included in the 2000 General Social Survey to measure the common manifestations of prejudice, stereotypes, and social distance.

The survey results showed on average that non-Hispanic Whites were much older, better educated, had much higher personal and family income, were much less likely to be working full time, more often had white-collar jobs, and held higher prestige jobs. Hispanics reported much more contact with non-Hispanic Whites than non-Hispanic Whites reported with Hispanics. This was true for all six kinds of contact: (a) personally knew, (b) feel close to, (c) as relatives, (d) from work, (e) from school, and (d) in community. Overall, these results showed that contact reduced prejudice in the form of social distance for both Hispanics and non-Hispanic Whites. Despite the fact that non-Hispanics did not generally think well of Hispanics, not favoring them as neighbors or marrying a close relative and having negative stereotypes of them, contact with Hispanics led to significant reductions in prejudice toward them, especially in the critical social distance area of favoring their marriage to close relatives (Weaver, 2007).

Other research studies demonstrate the effectiveness of intergroup contact friendships and prejudice reduction (Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns, & Voci, 2004; Pettigrew, 1997; Vonofakou, Hewstone, & Voci, 2007). However, little work (Hallinan & Teixeira, 1987) has been conducted regarding long-term, interracial contact, which has provided mixed results. Intergroup longitudinal studies also have revealed that optimal contact reduces prejudice over time (Levin et al., 2003; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) even when research has eliminated the possibility of participant selection.
Many experiments have been conducted, generally short term in nature, where the experimental work has consisted of a one- to two-hour laboratory session in which participants interact with an individual who they believe to be an outgroup member. For example, Wolsko and colleagues (2003) had White participants interact with Latino participants on a team communication task in which team members had to effectively work together to ensure that they accurately passed information from one team member to another. The problem with such studies is that the extent to which any reductions in prejudice after intergroup contact endure over time are unknown.

Reducing prejudice is an important first step to improve interracial relations. It fails, however, to fully address the process of turning racial diversity into a valuable national asset and that contributes to community and economic gains. Although contact theory has demonstrated favorable results in a recent meta-analytic study (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), theorists contend research has not adequately mapped out how interracial partners produce relationships that decrease prejudice (Combs & Griffith, 2007; Pettigrew, 1998).

A plethora of research continues to grow on the intergroup contact and its effects on race relations. This study examined the interracial relations between two different people, how social capital is formed, and the outcomes they produced. This next section will focus on social capital theories, empirical research, and perspectives that might provide insight into the formation of social capital across races.
Social Capital Theory, Research, and Perspectives

The literature on social capital has burgeoned in the last decade, but the idea itself has been around since Hanifan (1916) who considered social capital to be a key ingredient in relation to educational success. Hanifan wrote:

The individual is helpless socially, if left to himself…If he comes into contact with his neighbor, and they with other neighbors, there will be an accumulation of social capital, which may immediately satisfy his social needs and which may bear a social potentiality sufficient to the substantial improvement of living conditions in the whole community. The community as a whole will benefit by the cooperation of all its parts, while the individual will find in his associations the advantages of the help, the sympathy and the fellowship of his neighbors (p. 130),

Hanifan’s writing demonstrates that this intangible social asset could set the stage for greater successes beyond educational attainment. Hanifan saw the importance of social interaction with family, friends, and neighbors. He was convinced that lacking social capital could be detrimental not just to individuals, but to the community as well. His work was first to be credited with suggesting that poor social conditions were a result of low social capital (Boyas, 2007; Farr, 2004).

Little explicit discussion of social capital can be found in the literature before Coleman’s (1988) original work on social capital. He described social capital as a resource for action and its affect on the creation of human capital. Bourdieu (1985) discusses the convertibility of social capital into economic capital (e.g., a neighborhood babysitting group can free up young mothers to enter the labor market) or the
institutionalization of social capital (e.g., by conferring titles of nobility on worthy citizens) (Osgood & Ong, 2001).

Social capital consists of networks and norms that enable participants to act together effectively to pursue shared objectives (Putnam, 2000) and refers to dimensions of social organization that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions (Coleman, 1988; Halpern, 2005; Lin, 2001; Putnam, 2007). Such dimensions as trust, networks, collective action, cooperation, and reciprocity are examples of dimensions of social capital resources and refer to community connectedness as individuals and networks of individuals. Capital, in this case, is defined as any source of profit, advantage, power, or asset (Lin, 2001). If actions are coordinated between members of a group such that capital is enhanced by any member within or externally connected to members of that group, it is suggested that this enhanced capital extends to society and therefore forms social capital. Understanding the development of these social capital dimensions can provide possible solutions on how to improve the economic conditions of less privileged individuals and communities. For purposes of this study, social capital is defined as the social relations that facilitate individual and collective action.

Social capital is the measure of the amount and quality of certain social resources used to produce outcomes that provide a collective service to society (Coleman, 1990; Grootaert, Nayan, Jones, & Woolcock, 2004; Putnam, 2000). Grootaert et al., (2004) identify six distinct categories of social resources available that lead to social capital: (a) trust and solidarity; (b) groups and networks; (c) civic engagement, collective action, mutual support, and cooperation; (d) information and communication; (e) social cohesion
and inclusion; and (f) empowerment and political action. According to Covey (2006), trust is the single most important in every individual relationship, team, family, organization, economy, and civilization throughout the world. Covey suggests that lack of trust can impact economics because of its impact on speed and cost. Based on Halpern’s (2005) research, only 34% of Americans believe that other people can be trusted. Social network members who are actively engaged in the pursuit of desired outcomes, which become the desired outcomes that benefit society, use these resources. Broadening our understanding of how to increase social capital across racially and ethnically diverse lines may help forward Putnam’s projection of diversity becoming a valuable national asset, which serves as the motivation for this research.

According to Grootaert and Bastelaer (2002), social capital is both an input into and an output of collective action. To the extent that social interactions are drawn on to produce a mutually beneficial output collectively, the quantity or quality of these interactions is likely to increase. The key attribute to capital is that it is an accumulated stock from which a stream of benefits flows. Social capital requires an investment (of time and effort, not always money) to create a lasting asset; on the output side, it lies in the resulting ability to generate a stream of benefits. The empirical literature documents that social capital can directly enhance output and lead to higher productivity of other resources, such as human and physical capital. The concept of social capital has developed along three dimensions: (a) its scope (or unit of observation), (b) its forms (or manifestations), and (c) the channels through which it affects development. Grootaert and Bastelaer suggest there are two distinct forms of social capital: structural and cognitive. Structural social capital facilitates information sharing and collective action and decision-
making through established roles and social networks supplemented by rules, procedures, and precedents. Cognitive social capital refers to shared norms, values, trust, attitudes and beliefs, and is therefore, a more subjective and intangible concept.

Combining the work of Coleman, Lin, and Putnam (1988; 2001; 2000), social capital is defined for the purpose of this research as the value derived from social relations that contributes to other forms of capital (social, human, creative, economic, cultural, and symbolic) and that works to produce and improve outcomes and gains in the marketplace for both the individual and society. While the concept of social capital is applied within a wide range of contexts, studies, and disciplines, this review focuses on the concept of social capital, its forms, and the structural and cognitive conditions under which it arises.

This research frames social capital at the level of analysis of the individual. While Putnam argues that the level of analysis for social capital is more appropriately measured at the macro level, the individual or group level social connections are also considered important sources (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; VanEmmerk, 2006). Bourdieu (1983) viewed social capital as an aggregate of actual or potential resources that an individual or group amasses by being part of a durable web of social relationships. These social relationships and networks serve as key sources of social capital that can lead to specific benefits or outcomes, such as individual gain or growth (Lin, 2001; Portes, 1988). Examining social capital at the individual level is an appropriate way of examining social capital among African-Americans and Latinos since they are generally disadvantaged at the macro level (Lin, 2001), but they benefit more at the individual level due to their participation in large, close-knit social networks (Portes, 1988).
While measurement of social capital is generally at the structural level, this research focuses on both cognitive and structural forms of social capital (Grootaert & Bastelaer, 2002). Most studies of social capital are conducted at the macro and structural level. Understanding the cognitive influences of social capital makes this study unique, particularly since it is also based on long-term relationships. Some aspects of this research focus on the structural dimensions of social capital in terms of what participants do combined with what they feel in terms of social relationships (Harpham, Grant, & Thomas, 2002). Social capital represents cognitive and structural assets that create propensities and capacities for mutually beneficial collective action. These assets arise from roles, networks, and other social relationships that facilitate cooperative behavior and from norms, values, and other cognitive commitments that predispose people to work together for mutual benefit.

There is a relational aspect to social capital in that it is created, nurtured, and leveraged through relationships (Bowey & Easton, 2007). Social capital is inherent in the structure of relations between actors and among actors, as Coleman (1988) suggested, and it resides in people’s minds. The roles that people recognize, accept, and perform and the norms, values, attitudes, and beliefs they hold structure people’s relationships with each other (Grootaert et al., 2004). Coleman suggests the virtues of social capital lie in its ability to describe action in social context and to explain the way action is shaped, constrained, and redirected by the social context. For example, he describes social capital as being defined by two elements: they all consist of some aspect of social structure and they facilitate certain actions of actors. He describes three forms of social capital as obligations and expectations, information channels, and social norms. Grootaert and
Bastelaer (2002) describe several channels by which social capital can be made to produce a stream of benefits to society: information sharing, mutually beneficial collective action, and decision making. These channels can help to produce benefits that lead to other forms of capital, such as human capital, economic capital, and symbolic capital. Social capital can lower information uncertainty by spreading knowledge or by making the behavior of others more predictable.

The creation of social capital, unlike other forms of capital, requires interaction between at least two people and usually among a larger group of people. According to Putnam (1993), social capital is largely determined by historical factors; it can thus not be enhanced in the short term, months and years, rather than days. Social capital comes about through changes in the relations among persons that facilitate action. Human capital is created by changes in persons that bring about skills and capabilities that make them able to act in new ways. Coleman (1988, 1990) suggests that the most important aspect of social capital is its effect on the creation of human capital, particularly in the next generation.

Goddard’s (2003) study supports Coleman’s claim and showed that fourth-grade graduate students’ odds of passing state-mandated mathematics and writing assessments are increased in urban schools characterized by a high level of social capital. According to Goddard, students’ performance improves by having access to various forms of social support that facilitate their success in school. Several studies have shown a connection between strong relationships and student achievement (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Garnier & Raudenbush, 1991; Steinberg, 1996). In all these cases, social capital is viewed as a social resource that facilitates the academic success of students.
Considerable evidence shows that social and ethnic residential heterogeneity is associated with lower levels of social capital, not only between groups but also within them. Strong ties, or social homogeneity, make social bonding easier. In contrast, the greater the social and cultural differences between people, the more difficult it tends to be for them to form social connections, and the higher the probability of direct exposure to prejudice, discrimination, and conflict. If social and ethnic groups do not come into contact at all, there is no possibility of the formation of bridging social capital across groups to break down these divides. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is the kind that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of different groups. Pettigrew and Tropp’s (2006) meta-analysis concluded that face-to-face contact under such conditions does indeed significantly reduce prejudice. Unfortunately, of course, these conditions are often not met in the real-world circumstances under which groups live together.

Granovetter (1973) suggests that the strength of a tie is a combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding) and the reciprocal services which characterize the tie. Easton (1992) pointed out the depth of a relationship is measured by the amount of mutual orientation, the amount of interdependence between actors, the bonds (both type and strength), and these investments made by each actor.

**Dimensions of Social Capital**

Grootaert et al. (2004) identifies seven dimensions that make up social capital that relate to the research of this study: (a) groups and network, (b) trust and solidarity, (c) collective action and cooperation, (d) information and communication, (e) social
cohesion and inclusion, and (f) empowerment and political action. The following sections introduce the dimensions that make up social capital.

Groups and Networks

Coleman sees social capital as the social relationships, or networks, which come into existence when individuals attempt to make best use of their individual resources. Social networks can be characterized as primarily horizontal, with individuals sharing equal status and power or primarily vertical, with asymmetric relationships based on hierarchy and dependence (Grootaert et al., 2004).

Trust and Solidarity

Measurement of cognitive social capital is organized around the themes of trust and solidarity. Social trust has been defined as an expectation that other people in a society will generally stand for commonly held social norms, roles, and ethical dictates (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). Trust can be viewed as an element that extends the radius of others who are included as members of the public beyond the narrow enclaves of family and friends. When levels of trust and trustworthiness are high among strangers, people have faith in another’s goodwill, and the decision to cooperate becomes easier because such trust will alleviate a person’s fear of being exploited (McAllister, 1995).

Empirical evidence suggests that social trust is significantly affected by race and ethnicity. Urslaner (1998) examined how race impacts social trust. A probit analysis found that in a national sample of 1,520 respondents, race was a significant predictor of social trust. African-Americans reported significantly lower levels of social trust even after controlling for education and income. In a separate study, Weaver (2006) examined the levels of social trust among Latinos and Whites. Using pooled data from the General
Social Survey, he found that English-speaking Latinos (N=971) were significantly less likely to report high levels of social trust compared to Whites.

Patterson (1999) concludes that irrespective of social class, African-Americans are the least trusting group in the United States. He attributes this lack of trust to the lived experiences of African-Americans that date back to the days of slavery. The historical legacy of slavery is fundamental in partially examining the present psychosocial conditions of African-Americans (Song, 2004).

Latinos, too, have had to deal with a history of negative experiences that could potentially contribute to lower levels of trust. Regarding Mexican-Americans, Luhman and Gilman (1980) argue that:

health The message in the history of Mexican-Americans is clear: Mexicans are welcome only if their activities can be controlled so as to be useful to the already established upper classes. Like slaves before them, Mexicans were useful only in particular exploited activities, and considerable effort was expended to see that they had other options (p. 230).

It is conceivable that living through slave-like conditions, separate and unequal, redlining, and economic exploitation, has made it difficult for people of color collectively to trust members of the dominant society. These experiences contradict the expectation of not being taken advantage of, thereby leading individuals to lose faith in others and decreasing degrees of interracial trust.

While the literature on social capital has grown, researchers have paid little attention to the issue of race (Hero, 2003; Segura, Pachon, & Woods, 2001). Many studies have touched on race but not provided conclusive or consistent empirical
evidence on racial and ethnic differences. The unequal distribution of wealth in America makes this an important subject and an important knowledge base to research. Social assets including power, status, wealth, and opportunity are distributed unequally based on group membership, with Whites usually benefiting from such hierarchical social structures (Potapchuk, Crocker, & Schechter, 1997).

Collective Action and Cooperation

Social interaction produces coordinated action in various ways. Much coordinated action requires some process of collective decision, which in turn, requires either an accepted hierarchal or a club rather than just a network or one-way social interaction. Although clubs and hierarchical organizations may help form norm, they do so only because they double as networks and forms of one-way social interaction (Grootaert et al., 2004).

Information and Communication

According to Coleman (1988), an important aspect of social capital is the potential for information that inheres in social relations. Information is important in providing a basis for action. In the same study, adding one more source of information to those already used by a household appears to enhance its social capital by 0.8 points on average, all other things remaining constant. A study by Katz and Lazarsfel (1955) cited by Coleman, showed how this operated for a woman in the early 1950s. The study showed that a woman with an interest in being in fashion, but not interested in being on the leading edge of fashion, used friends who she knew kept up with fashion as sources of information.
Based on a study conducted by Krishna and Uphoff (2002), information had a statistically significant correlation with social capital. This study was based on 2,397 individuals, split about evenly between men and women, and 64 focus group sessions with village leaders and elected representatives. The study was done to determine if certain social-structural or cognitive variables associated with social capital could explain differences in the measured manifestation of mutually beneficial collective action.

**Social Cohesion and Inclusion**

Communities are not single entities, but rather are characterized by various forms of division and difference that can lead to conflict or cohesion (Grootaert et al., 2004). According to Grootaert et al, one of the positive manifestations of a high level of social capital in the community is the occurrence of frequent, every-day social interactions. This sociability can take the form of meetings with people in public places, visits to other people’s homes or visits from others into one’s own home, and participation in community events such as sports or ceremonies. They also purport that the presence of conflict in a community or in a larger area is often an indicator of the lack of trust or the lack of appropriate structural social capital to resolve conflicts, or both. Likewise, different communities can have vastly different experiences with conflict and violence, even if they are geographically close.

**Empowerment and Political Action**

One of the key measures for how engaged we are in communities is the extent to which we are involved politically. This measure looked at how many people in our communities are registered to vote, actually vote, express interest in politics, are knowledgeable about political affairs, and read the newspaper regularly. The data in the
Social Community Benchmark Survey indicated that many communities that exhibit low levels of participation in conventional/electoral ways nonetheless exhibit high levels of participation in protest forms. Protest politics participation addresses this level of social capital. Civic leadership and associational involvement measure people joining groups about which they care.

Other dimensions of social capital include informal socializing, giving and volunteering, and faith-based engagement. Informal socializing is more likely to be developed by some members of a community through informal friendships. One of the ways that Americans express their concern for others is through giving to charity or volunteering. Religion in America is a big part of social capital. Roughly one-half of all American connectedness is through religions or religiously affiliated.

**Benefits of Social Capital**

Social capital makes communities safer and more proactive. Criminologists have been studying the effects of social capital on communities since the early 1920s as a way to explain why communities experience criminal behavior. Sampson and Morenoff (1997) explained:

> Communities characterized by anonymity and space acquaintanceship networks among residents, unsupervised teenager peer groups and attenuated control of public space, and a weak organization base and low social participation in local activities face an increased risk of crime and violence (pp. 1-22).

Saegut, Winkel & Swarts (2002) presented evidence that components of social capital can play a positive role in preventing crime in low-income housing. Their study compared five programs that house New York’s poorest residents. They found
participation in tenant associations, and a building’s formal organization was related to the amount of crime that occurred within the housing units.

Social capital leads to economic development. James Coleman (1990) wrote about the benefits of social capital at the individual level. He cited the example of Jewish diamond merchants in New York City. The merchants saved large amounts of money on business costs, such as lawyer’s fees, by conducting transactions informally. The system was based on trust and tight social circles. Merchants were able to lend diamonds overnight for examination and know they were going to be safe.

Surveys of the unemployed have shown that they rely heavily on family and friends to find job openings. In one survey, 85% of young men said they had used personal networks to find employment, while 55% reported using state agencies and newspapers (Portes & Landolt, 1996).

**Social Capital Formation**

Grootaert and Bastelaer (2002) describe the concept of social capital as having been developed along three dimensions: scope, forms, and channels. Regarding scope, Putnam (1993), Coleman (1990), North (1990), and Olson (1982) have contributed greatly to social capital as viewed at the *micro*, *meso*, and *macro* levels. Putnam describes social capital as those features of social organization, such as networks of individuals or households, and the associated norms and values that create externalities for the community as a whole. Coleman expands the unit of observation that includes individuals as well as both vertical and horizontal associations and behaviors of networks which facilitate certain actions of actors, whether personal or corporate actors within the structure. The third view of social capital is at the *macro* level and is espoused by both
North and Olson. Social capital at the macro levels includes the social and political environment that shapes social structure and enables norms to develop. Thus, this macro view also includes the most formalized institutional relationships and structures, such as the political regime, the rule of law, the court system, and civil and political liberties.

Grootaert and Bastelaer (2002) explain the existence of two forms of social capital: *structural* and *cognitive*. Structural social capital facilitates information sharing and collection action and decision-making through established roles and social networks supplemented by rules, procedures, and precedents. Structural social capital is an observable construct. Cognitive social capital refers to shared norms, values, trusts, attitudes, and beliefs and is, therefore, a more subjective and intangible concept. Cognitive and structural social capitals are not necessarily complementary. There can be a personal cognitive bond that may not be reflected in a formal structural arrangement. Similarly, the existence of a community association does not necessarily testify to strong personal connections among its members. This occurs either when the participation in its activities is not voluntary or because its existence has outlasted the external factor that led to its creation. Social interaction can become cognitive social capital through the persistence of the bonding effects of the continued interaction. For example, a sports organization that embodies the values and goals of the social interaction initiated by founding members could survive and have lasting effects on individuals beyond the original members.

Social capital can accumulate as a result of its use. Social capital is both an input and an output of collective action. To the extent that social interactions are drawn on to produce a mutually beneficial output, the quantity or quality of these interactions is likely
to increase. Creating and activating social capital requires at least two people and has public-good characteristics that have direct implications for the optimality of its production level (Grootaert & Bastelaer, 2002; Lin, 2001).

According to Osgood and Ong (2001), theatrical frameworks do not wholly address the question of relevant indicators for social capital formation. They maintain that related to this problem is the issue of confusing social capital determinants with social capital outcomes when choosing indicators (Rose, 1998). Putnam’s (1993b) social capital indicators attempt to measure civicness, but they do not differentiate between this as a predisposing factor or as an outcome of social capital, and it could be argued that they both measure the chicken and the egg. Edwards and Foley (1998) further caution against attempts to measure fuzzy concepts such as trust and civil society. These concepts tend to be fitted into complex and constrictive definitions or are reduced to ideal types before proxy indicators can be developed to measure them. Osgood and Ong contend that the process becomes fraught with inaccuracies.

Edwards and Foley (1998) emphasize the dynamic nature of social capital, its creation, maintenance, impact and destruction over time. They highlight the need to develop indicators that accommodate the temporal aspects of social capital and that can be applied accurately in longitudinal studies. They contend that despite the development of a number of generic theoretical frameworks, there is considerable room for improvement in theoretical understanding, in particular of social capital formation. Osgood and Ong (2001) contend there is a shortage of qualitative studies and social capital indicators that need to be refined in terms of their selection, use, and interpretation. They suggest that the lack of studies at the macro level is significant.
largely because little research has been done and findings have been mixed and inconclusive. These critiques make the current study a valuable contribution to the qualitative study on social capital study. Longitudinal study of the same database could provide insight into the temporal nature of social capital.

**Community Benchmark Survey**

The *Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey* is a recognized social capital survey developed by The Saguaro Seminar (2000). The *Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America* is an initiative of Professor Robert D. Putnam (2000) at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. The *Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey* is the largest scientific investigation of social capital ever conducted in the U.S. and was designed to map relative strengths and areas for improvement of communities in the area of social capital. Nearly 30,000 respondents were surveyed in 40 communities across 29 states. Using the results of Putnam’s findings after researching 41 metropolitan communities and 27 states, the *Saguaro Seminar* (2000) defined social capital as:

> The central premise of social capital is that social networks have value. Social capital refers to the collective value of all "social networks" [who people know] and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other ["norms of reciprocity"].

The principal investigator on this project was Prof. Robert. D. Putnam, and the survey drew upon the lessons learned from a Social Capital Measurement Workshop held at Harvard University in October 1999. Much of the survey was designed to measure the amount of social capital in various communities, but the data also allows assessment of
the distribution of social capital in those communities. The survey, averaging 26 minutes, was conducted by telephone using random-digit dialing from July to November 2000. Roughly, 29,200 people were surveyed. Using the results of the 2000 and 2006 Saguaro Seminar study, Sander and Lowney (2006b) reported disturbingly unequal access to social capital in most American communities. Rates of political participation, social participation, social trust, and the like are quite different in different social strata.

For example, Black and Hispanics were less than half as likely to trust other people in their neighborhoods as Whites (56% of Whites trusted people in their neighborhoods versus 21% for Blacks and 19% for Hispanics). Forty-six percent of Whites had six or more close friends versus only 28% of Blacks and 30% of Hispanics. Whites were more likely to vote and be registered to vote than Blacks or Hispanics, and more likely than Black and Hispanics to work on community projects or sign a petition. There are a few countertrends of Blacks having more non-family members treated as family than Whites or Hispanics and participating in more religious services, but these trends of lower civic participation and social capital were remarkably persistent.

What is relevant to this research study is that Sander and Lowney (2006a) using the Saguaro Survey data found that the survey uncovered the social capital of Americans who lack access to financial and human capital also lack access to social capital. The impact of low levels of social capital across racial lines suggests that the implications to access, skills, and economic opportunity are major impediments to low social capital. For these reasons and based on the Saguaro Survey findings, Sander and Lowney (2006b) suggest that while the level of civic engagement is important, there is the need to also attend to the distribution of social capital.
The survey results also clarify the serious challenges of building social capital in large, ethnically diverse communities. The more diverse a community is, the less likely its residents are to trust each other, connect with other people, participate in politics, and connect across class lines (Putnam, 2007; Sander & Lowney, 2006b). The social capital Community Benchmark Survey found 11 different facets of social capital that emerged from the study. *Social trust* is at the core level of social capital and is the question of whether you can trust other people. Inter-racial trust looks at the extent to which different racial groups (Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians) trust one another and is, thus, one proxy for the health of inter-racial relations in a community. Diversity of friendships looks at how diverse people’s social networks are. This was determined in the study by adding up how many of 11 categories each respondent mentioned is gay, is White, or is a manual worker.

*The 2006 Community Benchmark Survey*

In 2006, the 2006 Community Benchmark Survey returned nationally to 11 of the 40 communities. Building on the results of this longitudinal study, Sander & Lowney (2006b) found that building social capital does not necessarily occur in a linear pattern. The starting point of trust depends on trust levels. They also found that to purposefully develop social capital, you would need to appeal to people’s motivations and most likely orchestrate opportunities to bring people together. They cite four reasons why people usually form social ties: (a) they are offered a really fun activity, (b) they crave social contact and believe that getting together will make them feel better, (c) there is a pressing community problem, and finally, (d) they believe that their personal involvement will have an impact on the whole effort.
There are specific venues of social networks that form the pathway to social
capital formation. *One-on-one contact* is the most primary building block unit for
friendships (Sander & Lowney, 2006b). *Small groups* of 3-12 people are often easier for
people to get to know each other than large-scale groups. Small groups are generally less
formal and conversation often more open. *Large group* activities are more effective at
achieving change and give the group greater clout. Each of these pathways requires
different levels of trust and other features of social capital such as information exchange.

*The Warfield Social Capital Survey Study*

The Warfield Area Community Foundation (a pseudonym) was one of the
supporters of the Saguaro Survey studies and organized seven counties to participate in
the *2000 Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey*. The six counties, including
Warfield, totaled 3000 participants. In 2000, 39 communities participated in The Social
Capital Benchmark Survey, designed by Professor Robert Putnam of Harvard University,
which sought to measure key elements of *social capital*, including civic engagement,
trust in others, levels of social activity, and tolerance for cultural differences. This
original benchmarking survey was administered by telephone using random-digit dialing
techniques. In addition to the discrete community samples that were polled, information
from a nationally representative sample was also collected. In Warfield, the Warfield
Area Community Foundation polled 988 residents living in the Greater Warfield region.
This sample included a purposive oversampling of African-American and Latino
residents. This oversampling was done in order to best represent the views of these
groups.
In 2006, the Warfield Area Community Foundation participated in the follow-up Saguaro Seminar study. Seven hundred residents of the same six counties were again polled by phone. The actual survey used in 2006 did differ slightly from the original benchmarking survey. Harvard dropped certain questions from the previous survey, while others were added. The majority of questions, however, remained the same. Again, in 2006, Warfield chose to add a purposive oversampling of African-American and Latinos in the Greater Warfield area. And, again, Harvard University collected data from a nationally representative sample to complement the data collected by participating communities.

The data discussed in this Technical Report (Warfield Area Community Foundation, 2006) were derived from the combination of four discrete data files: data from Warfield in 2000, data from Warfield in 2006, data from the nationally representative sample in 2000, and data from the nationally representative sample in 2006. All these data were merged so that the impact of time, the sample (Warfield vs. National), and the interaction of time with sample could be studied. Nominal regression, including binomial and multinomial subtypes, was chosen as the best possible analytic strategy. These analyses are most appropriate when trying to understand the role of multiple factors (like time and place) on survey questions that are made up of discrete response categories. The statistical package SPSS 15.1 was utilized for all analyses, as recommended by Harvard University.

Results of the 2006 Warfield Study

Both Warfield and the nation suffered significant declines in overall trust between 2000 and 2006. Again, both Warfield and the nation experienced significant drops in
neighborhood trust. Analyses indicated that the decrease in neighborhood trust was significantly greater in Warfield than in the nation as a whole. Warfield suffered a significant, albeit small decrease in trust in this area, while the nation held predominately steady. Warfieldians have tended to trust the police slightly but significantly more than the nation across time. In Warfield, there was a significant, albeit small decrease in trust for white people, while the reverse trend was apparent in the national sample. Despite small changes, Warfieldians remain significantly more trusting of African-Americans when compared to the nation. Warfield experienced a significant dip in trust of Latinos, while the nation experienced a significant increase. However, overall, Warfieldians still appear more trusting.

Analyses indicated that overall, Warfieldians view marrying a Black person significantly more favorably than the nation does. Warfieldians are significantly more likely to report having an African-American friend, when compared to the national sample, and this finding is robust over time. Analyses indicated strong increase in political interest between 2000 and 2006, with the nation slightly but significantly more interested than Warfield. Across the nation, there was a significant increase in trust on the part of the Latino population. There was a notable trend towards a decrease in trust on the part of African-Americans, and this trend was particularly notable in Warfield.

Summary of Chapter 2

A long history exists of knowledge acquired on intergroup contact and the positive effects it has on reducing prejudice and the potential for bridging the racial divide. More recent studies demonstrate that intergroup contact has a major effect on the quality of education at all levels of learning outcomes. The implications of social distance
and lack of social relations between races may explain the low levels of social capital formed between races and the challenges faced with building interracial relationships. The next chapter will describe the research design and methodology used to conduct the investigation of social capital formation and outcomes produced across races.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the research design and methodology used to investigate the social capital formation and outcomes produced by business and community leaders who volunteered to participate and form interracial pairings in a structured racial opportunity intervention program. To contribute to the scholarship on interracial social capital formation, this study relied on the perceptions and experiences of: (a) African-American, (b) White, and (c) Latino-American male and female leaders. It begins with the research methodology, an introduction of the Prism Program (a pseudonym) as the context and description of the participants used in this research. It follows with a discussion of the participant selection procedures, data collection procedures and demographics, data analysis, and a summary of the methodology.

Research Methodology

A qualitative case study approach was chosen to expand the knowledge and understanding of a phenomenon in relation to interracial relationships between business and community leaders and their perceptions and experiences of forming social capital and the outcomes they produced. Qualitative research is the most appropriate type of inquiry in understanding the formation of social capital across races because the descriptive data gathered through personal verbal accounts provide well-grounded and rich descriptions that explain the unfolding of a phenomenon in a particular context (Miles & Huberman, 1994).
The dyad case study approach was also chosen because the impact of the participation in a structured racial opportunity network required the gathering of information from a select group of dyads that experienced the program first hand. The experiences of each of the participants selected for this study provide perceptions of their experiences relating to mix-raced pairing and the formation of social capital during a one-year structured program in the City of Warfield.

Using a qualitative research method, this research was inductively constructed, meaning that it begins with specific and individual observations that are used to inform the supposition of a general pattern (Patton, 2002). In the entire qualitative research process, the researchers kept a focus on learning the meaning that the participants hold about the problem or issue, not the meaning that the researcher brings to the research or writer from the literature (Creswell, 2007). The questions of why and how can typically not be answered completely through using a formal survey that allows for a set of forced choice responses.

This study is both naturalistic and descriptive. It is naturalistic in that, the researcher was not instrumental in the formation of the original dyads nor had any attempts to manipulate the phenomenon of interest (Patton, 2002) in any other manner. The dyads were already functioning under the coordination of the Prism Program, and therefore, were not structured for the purpose of this proposed study. This study is also descriptive in that it seeks to illuminate and understand characteristics of individuals, a group of individuals, and the meaning of a set of behaviors viewed within a particular social context.

This study, therefore, is hermeneutic in that it will both reveal and attach meaning
to a phenomenon. The phenomenon under study for this research is the unexplored experiences of the relationship between cross-racial partners that led to social capital formation. The primary unit of measure is the dyad, and the phenomenon studied is the formation of social capital between interracial partner participants.

Study Setting and Context

This dissertation research draws directly from the Prism Program, a racial intervention program, which provided an opportunity for business and community leaders to create intercultural dyad relationships in order to develop cross-race cultural awareness. The Mayor of the City of Warfield commissioned the Prism Program to reduce racial polarization in order to help improve the depressed economic conditions of the city. The purpose of the intervention was to build bridges between ethnic differences and advance race-relations. The hope was that with cultural exposure, these leaders would have an impact on the community using their sphere of influence. The Prism Program was first launched in 2001 and was selected for this research because its design was modeled after the intergroup contact theory practices that maximally show reduced prejudice (Allport, 1955/1979; Blau, 1977; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Williams, 1947).

The business and community leaders who participated in the Prism Program represent a rich source of information that may inform the interconnecting factors of interracial group contact and social capital formation across racial lines. Considering this combination of factors, examination of Prism Program participants offers a unique opportunity to explore a specific group of people gathered for a particular purpose. The civic community purpose aspect of the Prism Program was routinely communicated to
participants and potentially provides for a common goal or a possible source of motivation to build social capital.

There is a major contrast in racial and diversity distribution in the City of Warfield compared to U.S. demographics. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, 2006 American Community Survey, the City of Warfield has a population of 54% people of color, compared to the 28% U.S. average, and fewer than 2% people of color residing in the surrounding suburbs. At the time of this study, the City of Warfield suffers high child poverty levels, the 10th highest poverty rate in the country, as well as high unemployment rates and corresponding high crime rates. The contrast and the poverty rate makes the City of Warfield a potentially rich source of information, particularly since many of the White participants were from the surrounding suburbs.

The Prism Program formed three structural networks within the opportunity network: (a) face-to-face dyad pairings, (b) small cluster networks made up of no more than ten dyads, and (c) a large cohort group comprised of all dyad participants in a given year. These structures were intended to provide increased social interaction and opportunities to form social capital. For example, based on this pathway, face-to-face dyad networks could conceivably migrate interests and collective action within smaller cluster networks (ten individuals or less) and then move to larger group interactions (11 or more) as a means of building social capital. This study, however, focuses on the dyad pairing in order to understand the conditions under which the relationship evolved between the dyads to form components of social capital.

The Prism Program targeted business and community leaders and paired them on the basis of: (a) their leadership and level of influence within the community; (b) each
partner having a different ethnicity or race; for example, Whites were paired with
African-Americans and Persians with African-Americans; and (c) participants shared
common interests. These three pairing methods are also consistent with Williams (1947)
who noted that intergroup contact would maximally reduce prejudice when the two
groups share similar status, interests, and tasks and when the situation fosters personal,
intimate intergroup contact.

During the first year, a city official interviewed each participant and based on his
assessment, paired dyads according to shared interest. In subsequent years, a formal
survey was administered to determine participant’s interests and was entered into a
software program containing algorithms to systematically match pairings based on shared
interests. Participants may or may not have known or knew of their partners prior to the
pairings and were introduced to their partners at the first group meeting.

The Prism Program initially targeted top leaders across races that were selected on
the basis of their ability to influence the communities within which they operated.
Between 2001-2007, the Prism Program recruited approximately 500 such leaders and
middle managers from various sectors of the Warfield community, including business,
government, education, religious, non-profit, etc. The Program was designed to
encourage Warfield’s top leaders operating within a broad range of disciplines and
having the greatest potential distributed influence on the community to launch the
Program. The idea of starting at the highest level of influence was to create enough
momentum and force to be able to expand the Prism Program to people in every stratum
and sector of the City of Warfield including those residing outside the City of Warfield.
The intervention was a guided experience that was designed to foster trusting relationships through dyad formation and guidelines, reading materials, coach-facilitated dialogues, and presentations with business and community leaders. Selected leaders received a personal invitation from the Mayor of Warfield to participate in the Program and were free to accept or reject the invitation. Following the first year and each year thereafter, graduating participants were requested to nominate future participants who also received a formal invitation from the Mayor of Warfield stating that they had been nominated to participate in the Prism Program. The nominated participants in later cohorts were also free to accept or decline the invitation to participate.

The Prism Program also maintained four levels of structured interaction: (a) monthly, face-to-face dyad meetings; (b) monthly cluster gatherings comprised of no more than ten dyads; (c) coaches who facilitated cluster gatherings and served as a support on an as-needed basis; and (d) two group meetings comprised of all participants who met once at the beginning and once at the end of the program. Dyads were guided through a one-year process of building relationships and trust. To aid this process, the participants were provided a manual of suggested dialogue questions to discuss during face-to-face meetings that guided increased levels of self-disclosure in order to deepen the relationship. The dyads were also instructed to meet at least once a month for 12 months and maintain face-to-face meetings that could be held at their choice of location and choice of activity (e.g., movies, lunch, and home). In addition to face-to-face time, each participant was a part of a cluster group that met monthly with coaches facilitating additional structured exercises.
Study Participants

To obtain rich cases for in-depth study, a purposeful sampling method was used to identify the four dyads, which applied two of Patton’s (1990) strategies: (a) extreme and deviant case sampling and (b) criterion sampling. First, extreme and deviant case sample involves learning from highly unusual manifestations of the phenomenon of interest. According to Patton, the logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research. The phenomenon under investigation is interracial social capital formation. Since not all the participants of the Prism Program formed social capital or demonstrated feature of social capital, known cases offering the best opportunity to study the phenomenon were required to be identified for this study.

To identify extreme cases of interest, a team of leaders and administrators (i.e., coaches) who monitored or facilitated the Prism Program were asked, based on their observation of participants and dyads, to identify best-case examples of social capital formation. This approach provided access to rich cases for in-depth study. The administrators of the Prism Programs were assembled, and they identified the names of twenty participants along with their partners’ names. To be selected, both members of the dyads had to agree to be interviewed and sign the Interview Consent form in order to qualify. The Selection Team leaders determined the size and the qualifying database in March, 2009.

The target population for this study was drawn from approximately 500 community and business leaders who participated in one of the year-long Prism
Programs, which began in 2001. Leaders in this target base were selected to participate on the basis of their: (a) displaying representation of a broad range of sectors in the community, (b) showing their ability to influence the broadest number and range of people, (c) possessing a reputation and respect as leaders in the community, and (d) having established themselves as champions who were able and willing to make things happen.

The Selection Committee evaluated potential dyads based on Grootaert et al.’s (2004) six features or measures of social capital: (a) groups and networks, (b) trust and solidarity, (c) collective action and cooperation, (d) information and communication, (e) social cohesion and inclusion, (e) empowerment and political action, and (f) network expansion (Grootaert et al., 2004). Dyads that demonstrated their abilities in one or more of these seven areas were placed in the final selection pool. The selection criteria developed for this proposed study attempted to provide cases that offer the longest available period (maximum eight years) to build social capital. Those dyads that qualified were selected on a first-come basis and upon acceptance and availability. Consequently, all four of the dyads were from Cohort 1. The four dyads offered information-rich cases and long-term interracial friendships that covered a range of incidences of social capital formation. Because all four of the dyads were from Cohort 1, the research study is based on an eight-year period and provided extended opportunities over time to produce visible outcomes that benefit individual dyad members, the dyads, and the Warfield community.

Additional dyad selection criteria included: (a) both dyad members completed the Prism Program, (b) participants maintained contact beyond the one-year structure Prism Program, and (c) both members of the dyad were willing to be interviewed and willing to
be interviewed as a pair. The Demographic Information Form (see Appendix A) was used to collect data to make a final determination if participants qualified.

The target sample number of leaders selected from the total pool of Prism Cohorts was four dyads comprised of eight individuals. Sixteen individual interviews were conducted, along with a third interview with both members of the dyad present that resulted in a final total of 20 interviews. Each of the interviews were conducted within two weeks of each other to maintain a fresh recollection of the previous interview (Creswell, 2007). The interviews were conducted in March, 2009, and were completed in June, 2009.

An invitation letter was mailed to the selected participants along with an email version of the letter to prevent possible screening. All eight dyad members responded via email. The letter was mailed to potential participants and included: (a) an invitation letter, (b) a demographic information form, and (c) a consent form (see Appendices A, B, and C). The consent letter informed the research participants about the overall purpose of the investigation and the main features of the design, as well as any possible risks and benefits from participating in the research project (Kvale, 1996). The Demographic Information Form (see Appendix B) provided additional information to use as part of the research data. Sixteen of the candidates accepted, and eight were completed in time for this research. The selection process and identification of the participants began in late February 2009, and was completed by March 2009.

Participant Description

The data were derived from four interracial dyads comprised of eight participants. The composition of the four dyads included: one all male, two all female, and one
combination female and male. To maintain confidentiality, all written recorded information, including interview notes gathered during this study, have been kept in a locked storage cabinet only accessible by the researcher. Confidentiality of the participants was protected using a pseudonym that was unique to each participant that was assigned to dyad participants, and all information obtained from them or related to them was associated with that pseudonym. The demographic information about each dyad and member is presented in Table 3.1.

_Dyad Descriptions_

*Dyad 1: Samuel Jackson and Mickey Sterling*

Samuel Jackson and Mickey Sterling are both prominent leaders in the Warfield community. Entering the U.S. at age 7, Samuel’s early and professional experiences led him to be socially and multiculturally oriented. In contrast, Mickey, a White, Jewish-American, grew up in an affluent suburb of the City of Warfield where he has lived practically his entire life. Both are committed to their families and their communities.

*Samuel Jackson.* Samuel is an African-American corporate executive. He was a West Indies immigrant who has adopted the African-American race identity and speaks English, French, and Spanish. Samuel was considered middle-class growing up in his native land; however, this changed to poor when he arrived in New York City where he lived with his aunt in a low-income, predominately African-American neighborhood. At the age of seven, Samuel was guided by a Jewish mentor, attended both segregated and mix-raced schools, and has extensive cross-race networks. Many corporate mentors and recruiters supported Samuel during his early career in program development, counseling, and social services.
Table 3.1
Dyad/Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyad</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Leadership role</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Highest level education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mickey Sterling</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White, Jewish-American</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother, Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Samuel Jackson</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black, African-American</td>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father, Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Betty Clarkson</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black, African-American</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Segal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White, Jewish-American</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother, Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anthony Giovanni</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White, Italian</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father, Married</td>
<td></td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anna Vargas</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Hispanic, Latino-American</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother, Divorced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Official</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane Folsom</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White, Irish-American</td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother, Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Michelle Kelly</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black, African-American</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mickey Sterling.** Mickey is a White, Jewish-American entrepreneur. Mickey grew up in a predominately White, affluent suburb of the City of Warfield where he currently lives and operates a family legacy business. Mickey has not had cross-race relationships or interracial exposure other than casual acquaintance. He is very dedicated to the Jewish community and travels extensively to Israel to provide support. Mickey is great with financial affairs, and because he is very family-focused with a private personality, he is challenged with attending social events.

**Dyad 2: Betty Clarkson and Jean Segal**

Today, Betty and Jean consider themselves *soul mates* even though they are the complete opposites in appearance, organization, and punctuality. Betty Clarkson and Jean Segal both studied psychology with very aggressive professional goals and pursuits over the years.

**Betty Clarkson.** Betty is an assertive, African-American woman who grew up in the City of Warfield. She and her family were the first Back family to move into Amelia, at the time a fast-growing new suburb of Warfield. Very early in her career, Betty became a student activist challenging the system and writing editorials. Her first job was as executive director of a community center in Illinois. She has an M.Ed. in psychology, and currently resides in one of the Warfield suburbs after being recruited to the University of Warfield’s medical center as Dean of the Department of Offices of Medical Education.

**Jean Segal.** An astute politician, Jean Segal is the daughter of an entrepreneur and a stay-at-home mom. She had a very positive childhood living in Florida with her two sisters. She attended college in New Orleans at a time when segregation was the law of
the land and was always concerned about the unfairness, the inequalities, and the massive gap between the races. At a very young age, she launched her own integration effort by sitting on the back of the bus where at the time the law required African-Americans to sit, not realizing the consequences for those she was trying to help. She has lived on the West coast, in the Midwest, and on the East coast and is the mother of three children.

*Dyad 3: Anna Vargas and Anthony Giovanni*

Anna Vargas and Anthony Giovanni have lived in two different worlds. As a Puerto Rican female, she struggled to survive the challenges of poor background and achieved her education late in life. Anthony, on the other had, grew up around affluent suburbanites with Ivy League educations.

*Anna Vargas.* Anna, an only child, is a government council official and is involved politically. She is Puerto Rican and lived in a well-integrated neighborhood growing up in New York City where most of her friends were African-American. Out of necessity, Anna became a neighborhood gang member to help protect other young women of color. Later in life, she became known for her passion to protect those who are not able to defend themselves. Anna moved to Puerto Rico at the age of twelve where she married and raised two children. She took courses at Warfield’s two-year college and received her undergraduate degree later in life after taking care of her mother. Currently, Anna is completing her master’s degree and writing a thesis about health concerns in Latino communities.

*Anthony Giovanni.* Anthony is a White, Italian-American whose grandparents immigrated to the United Sates. He grew up understanding the virtues of early hours and hard work shoveling snow and helping with his father’s farming supply business during
the depression in the north end of Boston. With roots in the more depressed area of South Boston, Anthony’s parents moved to an affluent community where he was raised and attended school starting at the age of seven.

Dyad 4: Diane Folsom and Michelle Kenney

Diane Folsom and Michelle Kelly are at least fifteen years apart in age and were living in different stages of life at the time of the Program. Diane was raising a family of eight, and Michelle was just embarking upon a new marriage. Both are committed to social and educational causes.

Diane Folsom. Diane is a White, Irish-American female who leads a not-for-profit community organization. She has an extensive background in urban studies and economic development. Since her early teens, Diane remembers fighting for racial injustice and inequality. She grew up in an upper-middle class, segregated town in Northern Virginia. She was the class Valedictorian and received straight A’s since the seventh grade. She studied psychology in undergraduate and urban studies in graduate school, and by the time she was 22, she won a nationwide award for her urban effectiveness program situated in one of the most troubled communities in Southern California. She has spent practically her entire career developing a better quality of life for urban communities from the West to East coast.

Michelle Kelly. Michelle is an African-American female who has risen through the ranks quickly as one of the youngest Education Administrators in the Warfield School district. She completed her undergraduate degree, two master’s degrees, and doctoral degree all from the University of Warfield, one of the nation’s top 35 schools. She is goal driven and attributes her focused, serious, and disciplined nature to being a product of a
divorced family. To distract herself from the family environment, Michelle dutifully applied herself to completing her schoolwork and was determined to leave home as quickly as possible. Her father dated and remarried a White woman, and Michelle says she grew up in a cross-race environment with both White and Black friends, mentors, and relatives. Born in New York City, Michelle found the City of Warfield to be segregated and racially focused.

Data Collection Methods

There were five types of data collected for this study including: (a) individual interviews, (b) dyad interviews, (c) memos, (d) field notes, and (e) document collection. The data collection methods are described in this section.

Interviews

The primary instrument of data collection for this research was the interview, which involved: (a) semi-structured, open-ended interview questions; (b) audio-taping; and (c) transcription. Four dyads and eight individuals for a total of 20 interviews were conducted to show different perspectives on the dyad relationship, to acquire early racial experiences and exposure, and to observe participants together. When necessary, detail-oriented, elaboration, and clarification probes were used (Patton, 1990). The interview occurred in a series of steps, the first of which was a one-on-one interview with each individual and then a group interview involving both parties of the dyad. The interviews were spread approximately a week apart to allow the participants to mull over the preceding interview but not too much time to lose the connection between the two. All participants elected to have the interviews conducted at their office. On average, interviews lasted one hour and twenty minutes and were conducted face to face. The
entire interview process was completed within 20 weeks.

At the completion of each interview, a copy of the tapes were stored, one used by the interviewer, and another used for transcription. The content of the tapes were reviewed, and the first listen included recording memo notes of the major topics revealed as well as open codes for topics that had not been taken into account by previous coding. Potentially interesting or significant topics that emerged were noted and used to inform questions for subsequent interviews. Thoughts that were inspired by the interview were also recorded. The first interview commenced in March 2009, and both individual interviews were completed with one week.

*Interview 1: Individual.* The first interview was conducted separately with each participant to contextualize the participant’s experience by asking to share details about their lives prior to the Prism Program (Seidman, 2006). Participants were asked to reconstruct their early experiences in their families, in school, with friends, in their neighborhood, and at work (see Appendix D). Questions on the first interview included early and professional race experiences and exposure. This first interview also provided an understanding of attitudes, preconceived notions, and behaviors prior to the program. The first interview helped to build rapport with the interviewer and to set the stage for the second interview. This information helped the researcher characterize each interviewee as well as to comprise the study. The structure of this interview provided the foundation for the second interview.

*Interview 2: Individual.* The second individual interview concentrated on the concrete details of the participants’ lived experiences in the topic area of study (Seidman, 2006). The second interview questions built off the first interview in that the questions
allowed the participant to show contrast in behavior or emphasize where change occurred as a consequence of the phenomenon. Each participant was asked to reconstruct the details of the formation of their relationship and other network relationships established together (see Appendix E). The interview focused on the dyad relationship; that is, how the relationship differed from typical friendships and on projects worked on together or with others outside the program. Their responses to the second interview provided input for questions used in the dyad interview.

**Interview 3: Dyad Interview.** The third interview was conducted with both members of the dyad present and reflected on the meaning of their personal and shared experiences. A theme that developed from the individual interview sessions was introduced for both members to discuss in greater detail (see Appendix F). The third interview provided participants an opportunity to share aspects of their experiences together that may not have been shared in the previous interviews. It also provided opportunities to gain unexpected insights, ideas, and additional information. For example, questions were posed about the value they received from the partnership and advice they would offer others about the value of cross-race relationships. This interview provided the researcher rich data on how and why the experiences were different between dyad partners.

**Memos**

Research memos, or short writings, were done after the interviews. This was a way for the researcher to capture, record, and shape thoughts emanating from the interviews and research data and helped to keep thoughts and information systematically tied to the data. Memos were written and recorded in a memo-tracking book as well as
captured within the *NVivo* software. Memos were recorded regarding theories, methodologies, data, implications, and general ideas.

*Field Notes*

Field notes were recorded immediately after each interview that contained observations without interpretation. Notes included such observations as facial expressions, emotions, physical setting, and unexpected pended occurrences.

*Demographic Description Survey*

Background and demographic data were collected on the Demographic Information Form (see Appendix C) completed by each participant prior to the interviews. This information was used to validate information from the interview, to clarify, and to provide additional insights into the data.

*Data Analysis*

The analysis of the data was conducted using a combination of techniques recommended by Moustakas (1994), Maykut & Morehouse (1994), Strauss and Corbin (1997), and Miles and Huberman (1994). This is the best approach to use when it is important to understand several individual’s common or shared experiences of a phenomenon (Creswell, 2007). In this research, it was important to develop a deeper understanding about the features of the phenomenon, in this case social capital and the dyad’s experiences forming certain features of social capital. Phenomenological data analysis steps built on the data from the first and second research questions using interview transcriptions and highlights significant statements, sentences, or quotes that provide an understanding of how the dyad members experienced the phenomenon. Once this process took place, the next step was to develop clusters of meaning from these
significant statements into themes. These themes were used to write a description of what the dyad members experienced and the context or setting that influenced how the dyad members experienced the phenomenon. Finally, a composite description was written and presented in Chapter 4 that presents the essence of the phenomenon and focuses on the common experiences of the participants (Creswell, 2007).

_Dyad Analysis Design_

The unit of analysis for this study is the dyad because the research sought to understand the impact of the interracial relationships on social capital formation. Figure 3.1 shows a diagram depicting the case study design of the dyad data analysis used for this study. Both individual interviews 1 and 2 were first coded for each dyad case (steps 1 and 2) followed by the dyad final interview (step 3). Steps 4 and 5 represent the process of analyzing and extracting shared individual space of the lived experiences of both dyads as a single unit.

Finally, step 6 represents the themes that emerged from the results of step 5, or the shared space between dyad members. Figure 3.2 depicts comparing themes across all four dyads. The relationship themes represent the emerging themes that make up the study findings presented in Chapter 4 and discussed in Chapter 5.
Figure 3.1:

Dyad Study Analysis

Research Design and Methodology: Cofield, 2009

Design
The first level of analysis was conducted using manual line-by-line open
descriptive and interpretive coding, which was tagged and recorded along the right-hand
margins of each transcript. A brief description was given to groups, phrases, lines, or
paragraph(s) of words to designate basic units of meaning. The left-hand column was
used to record pre-analytic ideas: interpretations, leads, and connections with other parts
of the data.

After loading the transcripts and entering the demographics for each case, the
second level of analysis was conducted using the NVivo 8 qualitative software program
(QSR_International, 2008). This digital coding process entailed first capturing and
entering the manual codes created during the first level analysis. Digital coding was conducted through a process of reviewing, naming, entering, and later sorting into super-codes and sub-level codes. This second-level, digital-coding analysis allowed for segmenting the codes in retrievable card files linked to blocks of the transcript data: a clause, sentence, or paragraph, as well as linked back to the original transcript.

Recommended by Strauss and Corbin (1997), first-level coding was also considered for conditions, interactions among participants, strategies and tactics, and consequences. The software allowed codes to be created and stored by entering the code name and definition, which was instantly displayed in a hierarchical form. The code definitions at times evolved from a conceptual structure to one that was later modified to a more concise operational definition.

The software enabled a pop-up note pad for logging new categories of memos and for adding new entries to existing memo categories. This process allowed spontaneous recording of insights, thoughts, and ideas that occurred during the digital coding process.

Coding provided an additional review of the data and involved three levels of analysis: (a) open codes, (b) axial codes, and (c) selective codes or super-codes. The qualitative software package NVivo was used as a tool throughout the analytical process. The software will combine all the primary documents (transcripts from each of the interviews), codes, and annotations into an overarching hermeneutic unit, or related set of data. The hermeneutic unit serves as a container for the primary text and is used to facilitate and streamline the steps involved in the analysis. Sample codes were developed to begin the process (see Appendix G).

The first level of analysis consisted of appointing open codes to the data. In this
step, transcripts were read and responses were assigned a code, which served to sort data into a large number of descriptive categories. Coding was completed for all participant responses. Open coding also compared and grouped similar codes into conceptual categories (Creswell, 2007). Open codes that appear regularly across interviews may inspire new questions, or series of questions, in subsequent interviews.

The second level of analysis used Axial coding as the process of making connections between categories. Here, open codes were explored for casual and contextual relationships, which led to a number of emerging themes. Selective coding is the highest level of analysis and represented an integration of the axial codes into one overarching core code.

Trustworthiness

Several safeguards were utilized to ensure trustworthiness. First, the study was designed to achieve dependability and trustworthiness of the data by using three interviews to achieve triangulation. It was essential to obtain the voice of the dyad in this research. Second, triangulation was achieved using the three-interview structures to provide a rich source of information and to gain a better view of the validity of the explanation the research developed. Finally, a peer reviewer, or critical friend was used as part of the process. The peer reviewer helped to evaluate accuracy of the codes, the coding process, and emergent study findings (Creswell, 2007).

Summary of Chapter 3

This chapter provided a detailed description of the research design and methodology that were used in the development of this qualitative dyad case study to examine interracial social capital formation and the outcomes produced. This research
study is a qualitative phenomenological case study of four-dyads and eight participants resulting from Prism, an intervention program commissioned by the City of Warfield. The core participants were Black, Hispanic, and White business and community leaders who participated in the Prism Program. There were a total of 20 interviews including 16 individual interviews and four total dyad interviews. The data were analyzed by conducting multiple viewings of the transcripts, listening to the interviews, reading through the transcripts coding, and categorizing data. Salient ideas were recorded and supportive data were gathered under various emergent themes that were carefully studied to get the core essentials of the social capital formation and outcomes produced. This study provides empirical evidence on what is known about the formation of social capital based on self-reported interviews of participants describing their lived experience about what happened during and after their participation in the City of Warfield Prism Program.

Chapter 4 will provide the findings of this study through the recollections of participants who had personal experiences engaging in an interracial pairing partnership during the year-long structured Prism Program. The presentation of the findings will be structured in terms of themes as they relate to the research questions that guided the current inquiry.
CHAPTER 4: STUDY FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter elaborates upon the findings from the research designed to examine how matched interracial pairings comprised of influential business and community leaders formed social capital and the outcomes they identified and produced. Interracial social capital formation in this study is analyzed from the context of the leader’s participation in a structured racial intervention program and is interwoven throughout the findings. The dyads were selected employing purposeful sampling of participants who demonstrated their ability to form social capital by developing interracial friendships and producing social capital outcomes. The data were derived from eight participants or four interracial partner dyads, twenty interviews including two individual and four dyad, field notes, document collections, and researcher memos. Each dyad was analyzed and then compared across all dyads to reveal the emerging themes presented as study findings in this chapter.

Study Findings

The process of interracial social capital formation and participant identified outcomes of interracial social capital formation are two themes that emerged from the data. The first theme revealed two relationship sub-themes, which are elements of the process that enabled dyads to form social capital: cultivating interracial dyad friendships and bridging across interracial networks. Both sub-themes are covered in Section 1 of
the Study Findings. The second theme revealed specific categories of social capital outcomes identified by the dyad participants and is covered in Section 2.

Section 1: The Process of Interracial Social Capital Formation

Cultivating Interracial Dyad Friendships

Cultivating interracial friendships was the first step in forming social capital, which was necessary to evolve the new acquaintance pairs into a relationship status of friendship. This relationship cultivation process encompassed four transformative subthemes that illuminated from the research including: (a) overcoming social barriers, (b) initiating and engaging face-to-face contact in social settings, (c) making social and interracial connections, and d) cultivating social currency.

Overcoming Social Barriers

Overcoming social barriers was a common theme among dyads. Social barriers such as unnatural cross-racial engagements, time constraints, expectations, and early social and racial conditioning are a few examples that emerged from the data.

Unnatural interracial social engagements. Cultivating the interracial friendship relationship was a unique and unusual experience for the dyad members largely because the interracial relationship engagement was not natural. This was not only because cross-race relationships are a rare occurrence among leaders in Warfield’s segregated communities, but also because of the contrived nature of the program-initiated relationship. Samuel, who immigrated to the U.S. over 50 years ago, believed this unnatural phenomenon and the fact that he and his partner did not share the same social settings as the reason the relationship took several years to reach the level of intimacy. He stated:
I don’t see him [my partner] in my social world; I don’t see him in other areas of my life, naturally. We had to create those opportunities by invitations and by reaching out through telephone calls. Now, it is a normal relationship. So, with both of us being busy people and having separate lives, our contact is very infrequent now, but when we come together we come together in a very positive, social, somewhat intimate way.

Anthony, a sixty-five year old White, Italian-American, shared a similar sentiment of Anna, his Latina partner. According to Anthony:

We don’t have natural things in common. She [Anna] is not part of my venue of networks. Our family didn’t grow up together. This [Program] is not the basis of any kind of relationship I would normally take the time to engage, especially because of time limitations. In this regard, this relationship is really quite different than my other relationships. What was common was that because of the Program, I wanted to know her, and see if we could be friends.

Ordinarily, organic relationships bounded by race and class, allow participants to make their own relationship choices about who they will become friends with, for what reasons, and the amount of engagement time they spend together. These organic interactions generally produce shared understandings, experiences, and meanings between individuals within natural environments with others who are similar by race and class.

Diane, a White, Irish-American who has been dedicated to racial causes since she was 13, described how difficult it is for members of her organization to transcend reliance on organic networks and get her staff to be more inclusive. She stated:
I try hard to make sure that our social events are diverse, and I am sorry, it still has to be planned instead of organic. I have to be persistent because not everyone sees the value of diversity nor have the networks to pull from.

Diane recognized from her own limited access to interracial relations that other White employees may have the same challenges. In her statement, she demonstrated a level of cultural sensitivity in recognizing that deliberate persistence was necessary to inspire more creative attempts to diversify social events.

**Time constraints.** The inability to rely on natural networks is the reason participants made a conscious commitment to spend the time and energy necessary to form interracial friendship relationships. Dyads admitted to not having the *time* to form friendship relationships, regardless of the convenience of organic structures. They suggested that there are many opportunities for meeting *acquaintances* during the course of their work, but not enough time to turn them into friendships. Diane, a busy non-for-profit social executive fully engaged in community development activities and raising eight children, explained, “It’s hard to make friends, regardless of race. Because of my busy schedule, I need speed friends.” She suggested that a structured process like the Prism program, which provided a pre-arranged partner and social network for building friendships, is a welcomed support system.

Participants reported most of their *best friends* had been established early on in childhood or college and after many years of shared experiences together. Since then, participants have not had the time to develop *friends* was common among all dyad members. Samuel said, “It takes time to become a best friend, a certain amount of time sharing core values and world views. I have a handful of best friends, but lots and lots of
acquaintances.” Anthony, a successful education leader, reported, “it has been over 25 years since I’ve had time to spend creating new friendships.” Jean, whose political career has been a 24/7 job, said:

I try to carve out a little bit of time with my husband, and every now and again do something with existing friends. Even fitting in time for a little visit to see my mother or a vacation is a challenge.

As executive leaders, the decision and willingness to commit the time and energy was common among dyad members and necessary to build the interracial social relations needed to form social capital.

Social expectations. Diane also shared that she “wanted a positive experience, one in which I would get to know someone I didn’t know before, and that we could learn from one another and perhaps even become friends.” Betty, Diane’s partner and African-American professional executive, like other dyad members, shared her interest, values and views for engaging in the interracial dyad partnership. She said, “I am committed to giving honest feedback to my colleagues. It is the source of my staying power and the basis of my integrity.” She goes on to say, “I think it is important to try to establish relationships with people; it creates trust, which opens the door for change.” Anthony had doubts about the structure of the program but valued his relationship with the Mayor of Warfield. He said:

I am not a touchy feely kind of person. I go with mathematics, statistics and equations. I did it [dyad partnership] because I know the Mayor wanted to do a good thing for the community and I was willing to support him.
Making a personal commitment to time, personal values, and expectations were key to participants overcoming interracial and social barriers, particularly during the early stage of relationship development. Once the commitment was made to set aside the time and energy required and personal goals aligned with the shared vision of the program, the participants began to internalize or focus on issues pertaining to early social and racial conditioning.

Early social and racial conditioning. Some early social conditionings were more about concerns centered on values and expectations. Samuel, a politically astute corporate executive, shared his concern about engaging in structured, interracial dyad relationships from the perspective of a successful corporate African-American male. He said:

I think that the operating model for White people is a rich White person who has resources and may or may not have expertise in areas they want to volunteer in, but they become an expert by the fact that they have money. And, then you have the Black people, who become clients or receivers of the goodness of White people. My reason for the Prism partnership was less around creating majority, minority kinds of relationships and more around finding people who can evolve into an equal relationship.

In his experience as a life-long professional mentor and counselor, Samuel was concerned that people of color often get addicted to the pleasure of receiving, and White people get addicted to the pleasure of giving. “Sometimes,” he goes on to explain, “There is a resentment, perhaps unconscious, on the part of people of color, because while they are receiving, the relationship is unequal.” His interest and concern as a dyad partner was
that the value proposition for the relationships be roughly equal and that both parties be
giving and receiving from each other. As an African-American, for Samuel, this concern
was central to his ability and willingness to establish interracial friendships.

Dyads members brought their own issues and concerns around both social and
racial relationships. Some concerns were about race, but often mirrored typical concerns
of any relationship. Michelle, a very tall and reserved young African-American woman in
her early thirties, displays a no-nonsense disposition. She was very apprehensive about
her ability to generate friendships particularly because most of her time was consumed
pursuing a new career while completing a doctorate. She said, “I am not the social type. I
don’t just sit around chatting. People often say I am too serious because I get right down
to business with as little small talk as possible.” Michelle expressed her greatest concern
prior to meeting her partner. She said:

Who am I going to be paired with and are we going to have anything in common?
Are we going to really be able to sit there and hold a conversation? I wasn’t sure
how it would be, sitting around talking because I don’t really consider myself an
outgoing person.

Diane experienced a similar barrier related to her own early social conditioning when she
met Michelle for the first time. Diane is a rather petite White, Irish-American free-
spirited rebel, whose soft appearance is quite different from her reputation as a strong
community and equality advocate. At first, she was apprehensive about Michelle, which
caused her to have doubts about her own ability to make friends. She said, “I found
Michelle to be more reserved than I am and typically I have had trouble getting to know
people who are more reserved than I am and appreciating them.” However, after their
first dyad engagement meeting together, Diane commented saying, “I remember this deep sense of connection.” In fact, Diane much later in the relationship goes on to share how eventually getting to know Michelle helped her overcome her own social barrier of being around people who, in general, appear reserved. In this case, the interracial contact relations with Michelle served to build Diane’s confidence level.

First impressions, social behaviors, and attitudes. Other types of social barriers that presented challenges were first impressions, social behaviors, and attitudes. Although some first impressions were positive or even neutral, others were not positive. In the case of Jean and Betty, two completely opposite individuals both in term of punctuality and being organized, the first impression created an initial barrier. Jean, a White Jewish-American, shared her first impression of Betty, a strong accomplished African-American woman. Jean said, “Sitting near me was a woman whose body language suggested that this was the last place she wanted to be at that time. I remember thinking, I hope she isn’t my partner, and it turned out, she was.” Despite her first impression of Betty’s unwillingness to be involved in the program, Jean was steadfast to her commitment, but was now more concerned about whether they could make the relationship work, and even then, the amount of energy it would take. At their first meeting, Jean confronted Betty with her initial impression. Betty shares her account of Jean’s reaction. She said:

The initial meeting was not particularly engaging [to me]. She [my partner] said I was distant, which I was. She was able to express her concern about the initial meeting and her perceptions, which happened to be correct. I apologized for that
and so I said that going forward, if this relationship didn’t work, it wouldn’t be because of me.

After learning about Jean’s concerns, Betty quickly changed her attitude and declared that it was her intent to make the experience positive and to make the relationship one that would provide as she said, “the greatest opportunity for increased understanding and relationship building.” Betty’s commitment to the goals of the program and the success of her new partnership became a driving factor. Jean’s willingness to be open and Betty’s ability to be responsive, coupled with their commitment to make the relationship work, established the foundation for what later became a long-lasting friendship. Today, they describe themselves as “spiritual soul mates” and demonstrate the value of building lasting, cross-race friendships.

*Initiating and Engaging Face-to-Face Contact in Social Settings*

Contact engagements between the dyads began with structured, face-to-face encounters and evolved into more informal activities and gatherings created and generated by the dyads. Initiating face-to-face contact engagements in social settings facilitated opportunities to cultivate friendships through a process of exploring each other’s lives. Participants quickly began to identify with each other’s experiences, core values, and worldviews.

Anthony and Anna, for example, live in two different worlds: Anthony a White, Italian male who grew up in an affluent suburb environment, and Anna, a Latino-American female who struggled with gangs growing up in poor neighborhoods. After the first few structured meetings together, they both decided to explore creative ways to interact in each other’s world. Anthony said:
We had some conversations within the structured setting, and then we said “why don’t we get to know each other’s turf,” and so we had a couple of the sessions walking in her neighborhood and eating at some ethnic restaurants and we had some terrific Puerto Rican food; it was great. Then, I had her come to my campus in my office, we walked around campus and had lunch at the Shuman Valley Country Club where I often have lunch. She also had lunch in my conference room with eight to nine other staff members and me, which was a typical occurrence for me.

Since the partners did not come together within natural contacts and within everyday networks, they had to push the relationship forward in order to make it work. This required carving out opportunities to meet monthly in order to spend quality time together to dialogue.

Establishing the meetings became the primary means for facilitating features of social capital such as exchanging information, building trust, allowing self-disclosure, and creating acts of reciprocity were components of the process for cultivating the friendships. The structured meetings created interracial dyad networks for bridging differences and making connections on commonalities and worldviews. Most of the dyad engagement meetings were conducted inside of their regular routines in relatively safe and familiar places involving food over lunch and dinner, or at coffee shops. While the program required contact engagements were completed within a year, dyads continued their relationship and met with varying frequency beyond eight years, which were still occurring at the time of this research study.
Making Social and Interracial Connections

During face-to-face contact, the dyads were able to observe, compare, and discuss personal and interracial similarities, commonalities, and differences between them through structured and open dialogue. Together, they discovered the what, why, when, and how of their interracial differences. Initially, they explored relatively safe questions that progressed to more subjective sorts of questions that required greater self-disclosure. Anthony, much older and more educated than Anna, shared his observations of the similarities and differences:

We both are devoted to and are supportive of family. She is first-generation college graduate and her parents were immigrants. These things we noticed right away. But, in many respects, we both came from two different worlds. We live in separate male and female worlds. I grew up around affluent suburbanites with Ivy League educations and knew a lot of the top CEOs in town, and she didn’t have access to them.

Mickey, who is more reserved and private than his partner Samuel, shared how these meetings progressed. He said, “It was going through those [program] questions and sharing our views that we began to make connections in terms of our commonness.” Having access to the structured questions helped the dyads share and make a connection with each other and as Diane explained, “The questions propelled us into deeper intimacy than we would have gotten to on our own. The questions helped us ask the important questions that we on our own would not have asked so soon in the relationship.”

Free-flow dialogue. As the dyads became more familiar with each other, they experimented with free-flow dialogue. Samuel said, “We let go of the workbook because
I think our boundaries dealt more around trust and more around familiarity with the person and our cultural difference.” Mickey shared the results of their free-flow conversations. He said, “We started to unravel the onion, you know, the friendship evolved and that’s what it became a friendship.” The structure of the program was helpful initially towards progressing the relationship along at a faster rate than is normal for strangers. Betty, who loves deep conversations and exploring the boundaries of people, said:

I think that the difference between the two of us is that I will engage why questions, Betty will tend to engage what questions. Now, of course, I think why questions are deeper than what questions and so I was always pressing her, “yeah that’s nice, but why?”

Some of the differences were personality characteristics and behavioral rather than environmental.

*Learning and understanding the “other” view.* Having the opportunity to learn and understand each other’s personal experiences and views was a valuable aspect of the evolving friendship relationship. Processing differences by learning about the experiences and stories behind racial differences gave dyad members access to other ways of viewing these differences, rather than prejudging. Having shared understanding and knowledge of the differences over time made it possible for dyad members to influence each other’s views and realities. Samuel said:

Part of my connecting is trying to be honest with the majority of the people, White people, about things like I think they don’t get an opportunity to hear too often because unlike most relationships, bi-racial relationships are too polite. I
think it’s a politeness index, you know, we’ll relate as long as we’re polite to each other and I don’t think you learn very much from that.

Mickey, concurred with Samuel, his partner. He said, “Yeah, and it’s because you don’t want to say something that’s racist, right, and then that’s after you say well I can’t say that, that makes me a racist, I can’t say that.” As the partners grew comfortable with exploring issues of race and each other’s culture, they were able to bridge differences with a greater capacity for cultural sensitivity.

Mickey and Samuel shared extreme differences between them: liberal republican vs. progressive democrat, entrepreneur vs. corporate executive, taking over the family legacy business vs. starting from scratch without any inheritance, growing up affluent vs. growing up poor. According to Samuel, it was taking the time to learn what it was like to live through the experiences that made a difference. He said, “But, while these differences still remain between us, they also are the closest things to us.” The process of sharing required more than exchanging information. It also required navigating trust strategies to determine level of openness, amount of risk, making compromises, determining sincerity, and willingness to accept a person the way he/she is.

Cultivating Social Currency

As the interracial friendship evolved, the dyads experienced a deeper level of social bonding that transformed into trust, intimacy, respect, care, and sympathy. These formations of social currency represented the social affinity, affection, and close personal relatedness developed over time, which generated a willingness on the part of the partners to be a reliable support to each other and to also engage in reciprocal actions. Mickey reflected on the time spent with Samuel. He said, “We went about sharing similar
experiences, sharing culture, sharing religion, sharing situations, sharing need, sharing interests, sharing similar economic stations. It was like we developed an invisible bond between us.” Spending extended time together created an opportunity for the partners to cultivate social currency, which became the social thread between them.

*Social bonding and intimacy.* One form of social currency that emerged was social bonding and intimacy. Diane’s experience of spending time with Michelle was almost nostalgic and helped the relationship grow deeper faster. She said, “I felt like I lived next door to Michelle in college. We started out with nothing in common, and of course, we discovered we had a lot in common.” Samuel shared that his time spent with Mickey was like developing a “culture together.” He said, “It takes time to share a certain amount of core values and understanding. It was like growing a culture that is invisible.” According to Anna, after spending time dialoging, learning, and understanding Anthony, he became someone very special to her. She said, “Anthony is special because of what we have shared. I have a million acquaintances, very few friends. I do not share that often.” Getting to know one another created a bond between the partners and a social intimacy that enabled the relationship to evolve from casual accountantship to friendship.

*Self-disclosure, taking risks, and trust.* During the face-to-face engagements, dyad members shared world-views and core values that revealed deep personal thoughts, feelings, opinions, and attitudes. This form of self-disclosure became a natural part of the dyad engagement. Samuel, spoke about the necessity to take personal risks to evolve the relationship to new trust levels. He said:

So, I think it was really through taking personal risks, getting feedback, and learning everything is going to be ok when you share your vulnerabilities. That
sharing vulnerability doesn’t change our relationship in terms of acceptance in both directions. I think once we began to see this, even though our differences remain very much significant, we began to trust each other and share more.

To reach new levels of trust in the relationship, dyad members took risks disclosing things they would not normally say to someone they did not know very well. These included sharing areas of weakness and not just focusing on things that were safe, positive, and the obvious. Building trust by first being vulnerable was fundamental to the social-norming process. Breaking down these trust barriers enabled them to disclose more freely.

**Authenticity, sincerity, care, and trust.** There was a range of psychological and physical concerns shared, particularly by African-American participants, which suggested strategies for measuring and determining sincerity. This included observing body language, eye contact, tone, and speed of responses are examples sited. The physical feedback was as important as the verbal feedback. Samuel, African-American male, spoke of his process of determining Mickey’s sincerity. He said:

I think that while he didn’t agree at times in terms of the content of what I was saying to him, and vice versa, his interaction or interchange suggested to me that he was embracing me as a human being, as a person. He was not necessarily agreeing with me, but he was accepting what I said on the basis of my logic path and how I go about reaching certain conclusions about my worldview.

Authenticity and sincerity was an important factor in cultivating the interracial friendship relationship. This provided a sense of being accepted for who you are and created a
positive social currency that helped the relationship move to new levels of connectedness and intimacy.

*Willingness to compromise.* At times, learning and understanding differences required dyad members to develop a strategy of *compromise.* Mickey said, “We agreed on doing things together through discussions and compromise.” Jean and Betty are extreme opposites in terms of planning and organizing. Betty is a very organized person and very focused, while Jean tends to be more relaxed and spontaneous about how she goes about doing things. Betty is very punctual and Jean is not the least bit punctual. The two make adjustments in the relationship to accommodate the difference as much as possible. Jean said, “Both our spouses were the exact opposite of each of us, so we each had that adaptability built in.” Compromising became a natural strategy in forming and maintaining interracial friendships.

Mickey explained that, at times, it was necessary to compromise with Samuel, particularly when they had opposing viewpoints. Mickey said, “You have to accept when someone is incorrect. I mean my wife accepts it from me all the time. I don’t say you’re incorrect; I say, yes dear.” Mickey, in this case, compared Samuel to someone he cared about, his wife. The willingness and ability of the dyads to *compromise* is a feature of social currency that led to more positive lasting relationships, mutual respect, connectivity, and shared purpose. Mickey said, “I wouldn’t necessarily make these types of comprise with complete strangers.” The level of bonding, closeness, and the fact that the partners cared about each other’s well being clearly indicated compromising was a social currency developed out of the developed friendship relationships that progressed beyond casual acquaintance.
**Mutual respect.** Through dialogue, spending time together, and observing each other’s responses to different situations, the dyads developed *mutual respect*. Jean’s first impression of Betty is quite different after spending time together. Jean said:

Betty is a wonderful person. She’s a very caring, thoughtful, giving person who is extremely bright and who will go the extra mile for someone. She also takes no stuff from anyone; she’s a no-nonsense person. People know where they stand with her, but she doesn’t give up on people as I’ve watched her with others. She’ll do what she can to help, that’s just how she is with her students and the connections that she maintains with them and for years afterwards they become part of her extended family. So, she has a level of loyalty and commitment that I value.

The dyads became more familiar with each other over time and enough to discern characteristics that they liked most about each other. This familiarity and discernment included expressing common values and those differences that they admired and that engendered affection and an endearing attitude.

*Personal and emotional support.* Diane and Michelle are about ten years apart in age, explored their differences as a way of having that extra special space in which to share. Because they did not know each other’s history, they discovered they could disclose more and found it was a way of providing emotional support to each other by getting things off their chest and having someone to empathize rather than criticize. Betty has helped Jean in support of her campaigns. Jean shared her thoughts about their experience of bonding together during and after the campaign work. She said, “There is that closeness, that connection, that bond that is there, and once it is there, it is
permanent.” As comfort and trust levels increased, the dyads began planning activities with members within their natural networks that spread across different domains that included; family and friends, business, social, community, spiritual, and political.

*Bridging Networks across Races*

Once the matched pairs successfully progressed through the first phase of cultivating friendships, they moved into the second phase of relationship development where they began to share each other’s networks. During this phase of the relationship development, participants began to expand their social relations beyond the dyad and across racial networks. These cross-race experiences advanced the relationship and provided greater interracial exposure. This level of network expansion often took the relationship to a higher level of friendship and intimacy and the final stage of development. Two components of the bridging networks across races process emerged from the data that includes: *navigating cross-race network exchanges* between partners and *expanding levels of bonding and intimacy* across domains.

*Navigating cross-race network exchanges.* Expanding the bonds to include shared dyad experiences within each other’s networks presented new challenges and complexities for the dyad. Jean and Betty were excited about the prospects of sharing family members and friends. The first opportunity was at one of Betty’s customary Christmas gatherings where she invited both Jean and Tom (Jean’s spouse). As an African-American woman, Betty understood the implications of making an announcement to her African-American family members and friends, and she didn’t want the issue of color to be a conscious factor for anyone. She decided the best way to
manage the situation was to not *qualify* their presence (meaning announce that Jean and Tom were White) because she felt that would demean the relationship. Betty explained:

I made a very serious commitment to not qualify my friends. Recently, I said to my [Black] friend, Jewel, we’ve got some friends coming in why don’t you just come on and let’s go to dinner and I didn’t say, “now you know they aren’t Black, you know, they aren’t Black” … I just said we’ve got some friends coming in and by the time we were getting in the car she and Jean had bonded instantly and when they left you know they hugged each other, and so it was a very smooth transition, but I never qualify.

Betty explained why this was important in her African-American culture. She said, “Because, if you’ve got somebody White coming to the event, you can’t do things that Black people love to do, which is talk about White people for the first hour or so.” Betty exemplified a level of care and balance for both cultures. She was aware of her own culture and the possible implications on Jean’s culture. This level of intercultural competency represents a challenge in cross-race friendships that requires skillful navigation.

Another similar instance requiring Betty’s intercultural competence occurred at the same gathering. She explained how within her social circle Blacks are biased towards eating food prepared by White people at such gatherings. On this particular occasion, Jean brought one of Betty’s favorite applesauce dishes to the event and “nobody would eat it” Betty said. She did not want to hurt Jean’s feeling, nor the opportunity for her Black family to enjoy the dish. She cleverly devised a tactic she knew would work in her culture. She said, “So I ate some and said, “Oh God, this is great, this is great. Oh this is
good! Who ate all the apple sauce?” She explained not having enough of something good would get others to want to eat some, and it worked. Later Betty shares how her Black family has accepted Jean and Tom as part of the family. She said:

But they are just so down to earth as one [Black] friend said “they’re just so regular” that you just forget about the fact that they’re white … and after that now when we have events the response [from her Black friends] is “When is Jean and Tom going to show up so we can eat?”

Understanding how to manage these cultural differences requires a level of cultural competency and stability. Sometimes, it is just simply not possible to manage. Jean shares how there are those situations, when her White friends might say something impulsively that Betty or Betty’s friends and family members might interpret in the wrong way. Jean realizes that some of this reflects racial feelings, but other times they stem from old habits that people have absorbed from their environment and their own culture that do not really reflect how they feel about people, but it can make others uncomfortable.

*Heightened social bonds and intimacy.* In this second phase, bridging interracial networks, participants often increased their level of intensity of trust, respect, and intimacy between the partners. This level of the relationship helped the dyads to successfully navigate bridging interracial networks.

Section 2: Identified Outcomes of Social Capital

This section of the findings focuses on participant *identified outcomes* of interracial social capital formation. Social capital for purposes of this study findings is the *interracial relations* that facilitate *individual* and *collective action.* Social capital
formation is defined as the creation of structural and cognitive systems resulting from interracial relations that collectively produce positive-sum outcomes. Four sub-themes emerged from the data that represents identified outcomes resulting from interracial social capital formation that included: (a) friendship, trust, and reciprocal exchanges of social currency; (b) access to people, networks, information, and resources; (c) financial transactions, power role placements, and leadership development, and; (d) interracial social sensitivity, competence, and confidence.

Friendship, Trust, and Reciprocal Exchanges of Social Currency

Making the transition from new acquaintance to friendship was an important attainment for the dyad members that brought added value to the interracial social relationship. Samuel said:

I think having another friend is always a good thing. Having a person in the business community that I can use as a coach, mentor, and champion is a good thing. And, then I think having him as part of my community network provides lots of potential opportunities for other network engagements. Mickey operates in the Jewish community, which provided me some other opportunities to relate to people from that religious sector that I would not normally relate to.

Once friendship status was attained between dyad members, the partners engaged in activities that enabled them to move to a more heightened level in their social relationship. They began to describe the trust character of their friendship and the reciprocal social currency exchanges potentially made between them. Samuel said, “I know that if I had an issue that I think Mickey could help me with, I’d be comfortable calling him and vice-versa.” Anthony shared a similar belief about Anna. He said, “If I
needed something, she would not hesitate to drop everything to help.” This level of trust and care governing the interracial social relationship allowed the partners to move beyond just sharing between themselves and allowed them to tap into outside domains to support each other’s needs. This mutual reciprocity and social currency exchange represented an advancement in the relationship that enabled the dyads to gain access to each other’s networks.

Access to People, Networks, Information, and Resources

As the friendship and trust heightened between the partners, they began intentionally making direct and indirect social contact across each other’s social networks. Samuel was able to have direct access to Mickey’s network of business associates and personal friends. Samuel said, “I was thinking about buying a condo in California and Mickey promptly introduced me to his realtor friend who lives in California.” Later, Samuel was able to share Mickey’s contact information with Jerry, a personal friend, who also needed access to the California real estate market. Samuel said, “Jerry told me it would have taken him years to make the real estate connections he was able to make in California and because of this, he learned a great deal about California’s real estate market fairly quickly.” When Samuel shared Mickey’s contact information with his personal friend, the dyad friendship ties were extended across interracial networks creating social access to more people, networks, and resources across races.

Samuel and Mickey indirectly extended their network ties by at least three degrees of separation. Samuel explained, “Jerry doesn’t know Mickey, but now he happens to know Mickey’s friends through me.” These reciprocating collective actions driven by the social currency cultivated between the dyad members and between their friends enabled
outcomes to occur across the country. Samuel and Mickey’s willingness to collectively cooperate and demonstrate their desire to support and care for each other’s needs and goals was the driving force for social outcomes across races.

Other such forms of *reciprocal currency exchanges* occurred through actions of mutual support. One such occasion transpired when Mickey wanted to introduce his son to Warfield’s political community. Knowing that *connecting people* is a particular talent and interest of his dyad partner, Mickey asked Samuel if he would introduce his son, Jason, to dignitaries at a local political event where both Jason and Samuel planned to attend. Samuel didn’t hesitate to respond and was able to introduce and connect Jason to many of his political friends that evening. These types of reciprocal exchanges led to expedient network connections, which allowed members to quickly access the right people, information, and resources outside of their own network to achieve personal and business goals.

*Financial Transactions, Power Role Placements, and Leadership Development*

Other social outcomes emerged from the data reflecting residual outcomes of social influence exerted by dyad members that included: financial transactions, power role placements, and leadership development. During her engagement with Anthony, Anna expressed her desire and interest in completing a master’s degree. Coming from a background of poverty, it was a long-term goal she could not afford. Anna said, “Tell me where would I go to get $35,000 to finish my masters to go to Warfield University? Anthony facilitated this for me. He showed me the steps, sent me a letter, and that’s what I did.” According to Anna, her education positively influenced family members as well as enhanced her professional skills and credibility in the workplace. All of which allowed
Anna to achieve her social calling of affecting the lives of others. Anna said, “My calling that I believe I was put on this earth to do was to assist people who are financially, educationally, or racially disadvantaged.” In this case, the social outcome surrounding Anna, was that she was able to achieve a long-standing dream of completing her masters to be able to more effectively affect the lives of those less fortunate.

On a more indirect level, Michelle shared with Diane that she was looking for funding for one of her student programs at Mercy High School. Diane immediately introduced Michelle to a member of her network whom she identified was a prospective donor for Michelle’s student program. Eventually, Michelle secured the financial funding from Diane’s contact. This indirect financial transaction initiated by Diane’s willingness to support Michelle spiraled into a multitude of social outcomes. Michelle said:

There were hundreds of kids who benefited from that program from the standpoint of preventing long-term suspension by providing the alternative education…We also partnered with Peace, an outside organization that worked with the kids to help the kids academically…It was also beneficial to hundreds of parents who were pleased with how helpful it was for them to find a positive resource to support the development of their children.”

The social outcomes of this single financial transaction facilitated by Diane and Michelle created productive interracial and social relationships that produced positive outcomes for the outside agency, hundreds of children, and their parents. Because of the scope and magnitude of the ripple effect on social outcomes affecting hundreds of people, it was impossible for the dyad members to identify and qualify all the outcomes associated with this financial transaction.
Social Influence, Power Role Placements, and Leadership Skill Development

Other social outcomes that emerged from the data included: social influence, power role placements, and leadership development. Dyads exerted social influence that placed their partners in key decision-making roles and position of influence as a way of providing leadership to their communities. Anthony said:

After we finished the Warfield Program, I asked Anna to be a *Jasmine Professor* and through this position help to implement the Warfield Program at our University, which she did. She also worked directly with our Hispanic and Latino students. In this capacity, she served both as a role model and an ambassador for the University because we also needed to increase our Hispanic and Latino student base, which she was also successful at accomplishing.

At the time, the Hispanic students were not organized to the degree of other student organizations, and Anna was able to make a contribution to the students by personally working with them and providing direction and did so until the Hispanic organization became stronger. The social outcome in this case was one that provided Hispanic students access to a well-connected influential Hispanic person they trusted, related well with, and felt supported by to help them navigate a stronger, more structured organization. Anna’s role in this capacity led to improved Hispanic student relations as well as student recruitment and retention for the University. Anna was also able to expansively apply her leadership not only in the political forums where she worked, but within the higher education sector as well.

Based on his own personal interracial experiences shared with Anna, Anthony decided to exert executive influence towards implementing the Warfield program at the
University. He felt the value of the cross-race partnerships would produce more globally prepared students at the University. Anthony explained his reason for implementing the program. He said:

My main calling is to find a noble goal and work as hard and smart as I can to achieve my organizational and professional objectives. I was hired by the University to provide a quality education for all students... For me, the diversity was an important goal to move my first goal of what’s good for the University.

He felt the best way for students, faculty, staff, and administration to become more culturally competent was for them to have interracial partners as best friends and to get to know each other socially through normal, everyday interactions and activities. He said, “There are many White faculty and staff who have never interacted with people of color before.” Anthony said, “These relationships are now occurring all over the University.”

Once the similar program was implemented at the University and at the time of this research study, over 500 students, faculty, staff, and administrators had participated in interracial social relations. According to Anthony, this single social action resulted in countless interracial friendship experiences similar to his own partnership experience with Anna. Because of the number of individuals who participated in the program, it was difficult for Anthony to identify the particulars of all the social outcomes resulting from the program. As a result of the program, today there are faculty and staff now at the University who have become best friends with interracial partners who see each other every week, and every month their families get together.
In addition, Anthony exerted influence and leadership when he made the executive decision to give the Mayor of Warfield, an African-American male, a full professorship with tenure without a doctorate. He said:

I did this to impart knowledge to students, to help them learn and understand the diverse world in which they’re going to enter. Academic knowledge is good, but students also need to relate to those who have been on the firing line year after year, have had to make tough decisions, have won and lost real battles.

According to Anthony, the outcome of his decision to create a tenured position for the Mayor of Warfield was a radical moment in his career. The social value of this tenured position was an outcome for which the Mayor of Warfield was able to benefit as well as both the White students and students of color who interacted with him.

Interracial Cultural Sensitivity, Competence, and Confidence

White dyad participants revealed that this was their first cross-race friendship relationship, and that the relationship allowed them a chance to acquire deeper cultural insights and understandings. Anthony, a White male University President, said:

Anna gave me insights and showed me what we needed. She took me to the Latino childcare center, elder center, Latino League facilities, restaurants, and to meet people walking on neighborhood streets. I got wisdom, exposure, and experience from her.

As a result, Anthony was able to be present himself as more credible in front of the Hispanic audiences when he mentioned his ties with Anna. He said, “When I talked about diversity I said well one of my best friends, Anna, and I’ll bring Anna in, and Anna says, and all of a sudden I had credibility not only with the people of color but with the White
people.” He made an impression with the White community when he was able to share his newfound wisdom, knowledge, and experiences because of his relationship ties to Anna.

Diane also experienced heightened sensitivity on racial issues as a result of her exposure to discussions with Betty. She said:

I have a more heightened awareness of the programmed racism that is built into our culture, the automatic stereotyping of the young African-American men at the traffic light. I’ve done everything I can think of to wipe that out, but it’s still there, and I am even more aware of it since the program.

On their social meeting out in public, Betty shared with Jean the inappropriate comments that Whites make to her, an African American woman. Betty said, “We could be together downtown having ice cream and some of Jean’s White friends will be introduced to me and they will ask me if I live in the City, or if I knew this person or other person who was also African-American. Jean saw after many such encounters, that most White made the assumption that Betty, who lives in an upscale suburb, naturally lives in the City where there is a large Black community. After being exposed often to these racial innuendoes, Jean said, “I think I am more cognizant of racial, ethnic, and religious bias.” Jean shared that through these experiences she has become more assertive now in trying to decrease or eliminate that kind of thinking and behavior and to do more outreach and proactively promote inclusion and diversity.

As an African-American male, Samuel concluded that most of his best friends were African-American even though he has maintained many cross-race relationships. For this reason Samuel initially saw the interracial partnership as just another cross-race
experience. Because of the constant face-to-face engagements and many opportunities for self-disclosure and open dialogue, Samuel found that he opened himself up more than he had in the past. As a result of years of dialoging with Mickey, he was able to experience a new level of growth in interracial relationships. He said, “I think it [the partnership] has helped me to fill my wisdom bucket because I learned about Mickey’s experiences and was able to utilize the learning and leverage it.” Spending the time to have safe and intimate discussions allowed the partners to explore even deeper levels of self-disclosure and understanding between them, and these discussions made them even more confident about their interracial competency.

Samuel said, “From an educational learning standpoint, sharing openly has been a massive opportunity to just understand the political differences between us. All of these things fed my growth as a human being.” The benefits of this learning were transferred into a greater level of cultural awareness and personal confidence in internalizing and processing early racial and cultural differences. Samuel provided an example. He said:

Because of my cultural background, some people might not appear culturally friendly. Mickey is not a smiler, but underneath I know he is a nice guy. Now, I am much more open, less judgmental, more inclusive, and more empathetic. I am more comfortable in bi-racial relationships and operating in bi-racial environments that may not appear to be embracing or inviting to me.

The interracial social relationship experiences and dialogue exchanges provided the time for the partners to nurture deeper levels of social intimacy and understanding, which allowed them time to integrate the new knowledge into their system of thinking and response to racial and cultural differences.
The dyad’s interracial social relationship provided the time to observe, learn, and reflect on their personal lives. Samuel said:

Opening myself to another person through this process has been growth producing for me, and I think it has been helpful to me as a community leader in extending my reach to places that I didn’t have in the past.

As a community leader, Samuel concluded that the experiences together created an opening for him to reflect on his own early barriers, which has the potential to create more positive racial relationships and experiences within community.

At the time of this study, Mickey and Samuel were speaking more frankly about their racial feelings and on just about any issue than they initially had in their relationship. Samuel shares how he and Mickey are now able to discuss very sensitive issues. Samuel said:

Well, I think trust is taking risks, saying things to each other that could have destroyed the relationship. Mickey is a Zionist and I was talking to him about Farrakhan. Those two things alone could destroy a relationship. The fact that a person like me [African-American] talking to a Jewish person about Farrakhan and not giving up my views about it and willing to discuss it even after eight years is amazing. I think this showed our willingness to take risks and yet allow each other to openly share with each other.

Processing differences, self-disclosure, and taking risks took time and gave the partners an opportunity to help each other change cultural views, attitudes, perspectives, and actions. Samuel said:
Our coming together and going through this process of sharing and disclosing ended up causing Mickey to vote differently in the recent election. I think I may have had some direct or indirect influence on him, and I think he has had some direct or indirect influence on me.

The data revealed that while most people of color had previous cross-cultural experiences and relationships, they found opportunities for more open engagement between the partners helped them develop deeper, inter-cultural understandings and insights on the experiences of their White friends. Having a better understanding of the life experiences of their White friends was most impactful for African-Americans.

Summary of Chapter 4

This chapter presented the findings from the research that included how matched interracial pairings formed social capital and the outcomes they identified. The data revealed that transforming a new acquaintance relationship into a trust friendship status was the first step toward forming social capital. This friendship status level enabled the partners to expand the relationship into multiple domains outside the dyad and within each other’s existing interracial networks. Learning how to navigate interracial relations across races became a necessary competency to successfully acquire new interracial friendships. Cultivating friendship relationships and navigating across interracial networks were the two major themes, which contained sub-themes that more fully described the process of social capital formation. Finally, identified outcomes of interracial social capital formation, the third major theme, revealed several categories of social outcomes from the social capital formation process.
Chapter 5 includes a more in-depth discussion of the findings that includes the significance of the experiences presented compared to the literature review, implications of the findings, and study limitations. This chapter also provides a recommendation for future research and presents a summary and conclusion to complete the final chapter and this study.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Introduction

The goal of this research was to understand how matched interracial dyad pairings comprised of influential business and community leaders formed social capital and the outcomes they produced. To explore this, a phenomenological qualitative case study approach was designed to understand the phenomenon of interracial social capital formation through the lens of the lived experiences described by the dyads. A purposeful sample of interracial dyads that demonstrated extreme cases of social capital development based on sample criteria was used to obtain rich information on the social capital formation phenomenon.

In this study, social capital was defined as the social relations that facilitate individual and collective action to improve individual and social conditions (Coleman, 1988; Lin, 1982; Putnam, 2000). Social capital formation is defined as the creation of structural and cognitive systems resulting from interracial relations to collectively produce positive sum outcomes. The social outcomes were those that were either indicated by the participants or observed by the researcher to be a direct or indirect result of the dyad partnership.

This chapter focuses on a discussion of the implications of findings relative to the literature review, emerging interracial social models, significance of the findings, and study limitations. Finally, the researcher provides recommendations for future research and presents a summary and conclusion to complete this final chapter and study.
Discussion of Findings and Implications

The Nature of Interracial Social Capital Formation

The findings of this study indicated that social capital was indeed formed across racial lines through both sustained social interaction and social cognitive and structural systems that developed over the course of the relationship. Individual and collective actions initiated by the dyads produced both individual and social value. Two emerging themes resulted from this study: cultivating interracial friendships and related outcomes produced. Both themes captured how social capital was formed and used across races. The friendship cultivation process and related outcomes produced revealed cognitive and structural social systems formed by the dyads that served as enablers to the formation of social capital across races. The collective actions related to the dyads operating within these thematic systems generated specific categories of outcomes associated with the dyad relationship. The following sections discuss the specific nature of these findings.

Individual and Social Capital Value

This study finding indicated that the dyads gained from their interactions by connecting with each other, creating bridge networks and new relationships, and accessing resources towards achieving either personal and social interests or goals. During their relationship-building process, the dyads engaged in reciprocal exchanges, social influence, and sharing each other’s networks to assist each other in pursuing personal interests and goals. These individual goals and aspirations on the part of the dyad members were instrumental in the social capital formation process as well as guiding the transformation of social capital into other forms of capital. Each was helpful in obtaining a deeper micro-level understanding of the nature of social capital formation.
Bourdieu, Coleman, and Putnum (1983, 1988, 2000), suggest that social capital leads to other forms of capital. Grootaert and Bastelaer suggest that social interaction can become capital through the persistence of its effects (Grootaert & Bastelaer, 2002). This held true in this study, which showed a variety of applied social capital uses stemming from the personal goals that led to human, economic, and symbolic forms of capital.

Structural and cognitive forms of personal and social outcomes were produced by the dyads as a result of their interactions and friendship cultivation. Cognitive forms of social capital that developed between the dyads, for example, consisted of deepened understandings, and cultural sensitivity and awareness, which produced social outcomes such as cultural competency and confidence. In the case of cultural competency, the social capital shared between the dyad members led to increased individual knowledge and skills. These added cognitive capabilities were naturally transformed into human capital as the partners applied the skills into their leadership actions, thinking, and decision-making. Structural social outcomes such as exchange and access to information, financial transactions, and social influence facilitated economic and symbolic forms of capital. Most of the dyads members, for example, used personal influence to place their partner on boards and, in some cases, to generate financial transactions such as scholarships and grant funding.

*Interracial Friendships*

Friendship was found to be the most prominent social capital formed by the dyads. *Cultivating interracial friendships* in this case was fundamental and essential to the social capital formation process. In fact, the *friendship* created by the dyads was also an outcome of the social capital formation process and is consistent with Grootaert and
Bastelaer (2002) who suggest that social capital is an input into and an output of collective action.

Achieving friendship status is particularly important since Allport (1955/1979) suggested that it is the nature of the established dyad contact that impacts predicting reduced prejudice. He maintained that relationships based on just casual contacts do not dispel prejudice; rather, it is more likely to increase it. In contrast, Allport’s studies showed that true acquaintance relationships lessen prejudice. In this purposeful sample study, the dyads achieved a more intimate relationship than just true acquaintance. The dyads described their friendship in various degrees of bonding that included: intimate friend, close friend, and soul mate. These noted advanced degrees of dyad relationship indicate that the dyads went beyond reducing racial differences to producing a more heightened quality relationship, one that lasted way beyond the structured period of the program. The implication of this finding is that true friendship can develop between matched interracial pairings based on their participation in a guided, structured process. This also supports Pettigrew’s (1998) theory that the formation of friendship is a critical contributor to positive change in prejudice.

A most revealing aspect of the study finding was that cultivating interracial friendships was an unnatural phenomenon among business and community leaders largely because of the lack of natural opportunities for meaningful contact. This finding is consistent with Allport’s (1955/1979) assertion that the tendency for human groups to stay apart is explained more by the principles of ease, least effort, congeniality, and pride in one’s own race. The dyad members expressed that they had very little time or access to interracial networks to support naturally engaging in developing interracial friendships.
The dyads acknowledged that taking the time to develop even same-race friendships was difficult due to time constraints.

Because of this *unnatural contact* phenomenon, the dyads needed the structure provided by the opportunity network to develop meaningful and sustained interracial contact. An aspect of the social capital formed by the interracial dyads was that it was not formed based on natural relationships; rather, they were initially contrived, systematically matched, and guided by program administrators. The interracial dyad relationships depended upon the intervention program to create a racial opportunity network of support. The network provided the opportunities and purpose for engagement as well as a safe environment to gather, meet, and form social relations. Based on the social capital formed by this purposeful sample, this research suggests that prejudice and racial barriers can be reduced and/or overcome through such formal interventions. This is particularly true when access is provided over a sustained period of time, which also supports both Allport’s (1955/1979) contact theory and Blau’s (1977) diversity proximity theory.

This study finding also revealed that overcoming the issue of unnatural, interracial contact and implementing a deliberate process to support the development of interracial dyad relationships led to interracial friendships. Thus, racial opportunity networks supported by matched, cross-race pairings and deliberate relationship-building practices, protocols, and prepared conditions can produce positive interracial relations and social outcomes.

An implication of this study finding is that the rapidly changing U.S. racial demographics combined with *unnatural* contact opportunities may account for Putnam’s (2000) assertion that there is a growing decline in social capital in the U.S. According to
Putnam, increased diversity breeds social distance, which further complicates the issue. The findings of this research showed that by providing bridge network opportunities for groups that are racially different, interracial social capital is formed and did provide gainful outcomes to both races. This finding may be an essential component to improving the trajectory of this nation’s social capital.

This study also found cultivating interracial friendship to be a formidable and complex process. Transforming the acquaintance relationship into one of friendship involved an entire process, one that required the dyads to overcome barriers, generate sufficient numbers of face-to-face contact engagements, and maintain a willingness to spend an appropriate amount of quality time together to address differences. The friendship cultivation process suggests that simply matching leaders across races may be insufficient to reaching friendship levels without guided and structured support.

According to Allport and Pettigrew (1955/1979, 1998), interracial friendships provide a context in which intergroup differences may be addressed to reduce prejudice and conflict. A great deal of research has shown that interracial friendships are associated with reduced prejudice and greater social confidence (Kao & Joyner, 2004; Pettigrew, 1997; Slaving & Cooper, 1999). Although this study did not measure prejudice, these research findings held true for this study in that friendships were established across races when racial and social barriers previously existed. Racial barriers such as lack of cultural familiarity and social barriers such as unnatural, cross-race engagement opportunities existed for all the participants. After establishing interracial friendships, the partners were less confronted by early racial conditioning and developed interracial cultural competence, sensitivity, and confidence. The interracial dyads also expressed that they
became more enlightened about racial matters than they had been before their partnership experience.

Allport and Pettigrew’s assertion that constant contact and friendship potentially assist in reducing prejudice is also consistent with the findings of this study. The implication from this finding may suggest to the extent that interracial friendships exist within a given society, the number of interracial friendships within a society may then be used to provide a measure of the state of race relations. For communities seeking to improve race relations or to address the needs of diverse communities, interracial, friendship relationships should provide access to improved race relations and social outcomes.

Creating Interracial Bridge Networks

This study finding indicated that the dyads began to share members of each other’s personal networks after the dyad relationship moved from acquaintance to a more trusting level of friendship. As the dyad friendship expanded to include members from each other’s networks, new bridge networks were created forming new interracial relationships. In this study, the interracial dyad friendships provided a form of bonding and bridging capital that led to the creation of bridge networks. The bridge networks were established through dyad introductions, referrals, and meeting engagements, which provided the partners access to resources outside the dyad to help facilitate both individual and collective action. Correspondingly, these collective bridging efforts made the opportunity network intervention a vehicle for creating a source of bonding and bridging capital as well as a source of bridging networks. The dyad’s friendship and
collective actions led to the development of social outcomes developed through the newly generated bridge networks and extended relationships.

*Interracial Cultural Competency*

The willingness and desire of the dyads to share members from their networks brought about a new phenomenon; that of navigating interracial group relations and activities. Expanding the dyad network was pivotal to the continued development and cultivation of the dyad friendship. Through this process of building new bridge networks, the partners learned to navigate their friendship within cross-race settings. These settings provided the forum for developing cultural competency, sensitivity, and confidence.

The dyad members increased their cultural competencies as a result of their cross-race friendships and extended network experiences. The creation of extended bridge networks and relationships emerged as a relationship phase, which required members to engage in cross-race cultural experiences. Interracial cultural competence and sensitivity proved to be crucial to the cultivation of friendship between the dyads as well as producing social outcomes. When the dyads were able to successfully bridge networks across races, the findings showed dyads bonded more deeply, which created a heightened *intimacy* in the friendship.

The dyads were able to transfer their cross-cultural experiences and learning into their daily lives. This was evidenced by the data, which revealed that the partner’s experiences deepened their awareness and sensitivity to racial issues and had a positive impact and influence on their judgment and decision-making abilities.
Evolving Social Systems

Cognitive and structural social systems evolved as a result of sustained engagements and social interactions that reinforced the friendship cultivation process and that influenced the opportunities for collaborative efforts towards producing positive outcomes. These social systems are briefly described in this section.

Overcoming social and racial barriers. The first social system developed by the dyads evolved around the need to overcome barriers related to early social and racial conditioning. Allport (1955/1979) contended that prejudice, or the act of pre-judging, contains two essential ingredients: There must be an attitude of favor or disfavor; and it must be related to an over-generalized belief. In the case of this research, there were four such cognitive barriers that had to be overcome in order for the dyads to cultivate friendship that included: (a) limited awareness due to lack of natural interracial exposure and meaningful experiences; (b) biased perceptions stemming from early experiences and exposure; (c) limited time and energy to commit new relationships beyond casual or associate acquaintance; and (d) pre-existing social calling and/or strong value core. Within these categories are included: time constraints, social expectations, first impressions, social behaviors, and attitudes. At the outset and throughout the relationship, these early social attitudes and overgeneralized beliefs naturally surfaced. The study findings indicated that the dyads typically confronted these barriers both privately and collectively, which allowed them to advance the relationship. The study indicated that dyads confronting barriers of differences made it possible for the dyads to form friendships and other features of social capital.
Initiating and engaging face-to-face contact in social settings. The second social system was that of setting up regular, face-to-face contact. Since the partners did not come together within natural contacts and within everyday networks, the dyads had to push the relationship forward to make it work. This required carving out opportunities to meet monthly in order to spend quality time together to dialogue. The face-to-face engagement meetings became the primary means for facilitating features of social capital, such as exchanging information, building social currency, trust, self-disclosure, and acts of reciprocity, which were are all part of the process for cultivating the friendships.

The study results showed that generating intentional, face-to-face meetings created sufficient opportunities for the dyads to get to know each other, build bridges around differences, and make connections on commonalities and worldviews. Most of the dyad engagement meetings were conducted inside of their regular routines in relatively safe and familiar places involving food over lunch and dinner or at coffee shops. Once they achieved a level of familiarity and trust, the partners began exploring other options for connecting with spouses, family members, and other social domains including business associates.

Making social and racial connections. The third social system formed by the dyads was the dialogue process used for learning, exploring, and understanding each other’s commonalities and differences. After awhile in the initial relationship, the dyads began using a free-flow dialogue approach from which to learn and understand the other view. This free-flow approach provided the freedom to explore issues as they developed. The findings indicated that through this process the dyads began to make social and interracial connections regarding commonalities, differences, and acquired understanding
about each other’s worldviews and core values. This component of relationship development was critical for bridging differences and making connections between them. Through this structural and cognitive system of making connections, the dyads were able to align, adapt, and assimilate what they learned from their partner into their own cognitive stream of core values and worldviews based on their discernment of similarities and differences between them.

The results of the findings indicated that friendship was attained through both interpersonal relations and the development of structural and cognitive processes. Generating structural engagements provided opportunities for the partners to observe each other in different settings and situations, which helped to build trust, respect, and intimacy. Halpern (2005; Putnam, 2000) refers to the social relations aspects as features of social capital. Building these features of social capital helped the dyads attain friendship status in the relationship. The implication of this finding is that the friendship attained was both a feature of social capital and a social outcome. Trust, where there was not trust, is also a feature of social capital as well as a social outcome acquired through the formation process.

*Social currency as an operating agent of social capital.* The fourth social system was the formation of social currency, which proved to be the most transparent finding of this study. The findings indicated that social currency was the connection between the dyads that provided the will and energy to sustain contact engagements. In this study, social currency is defined as the willingness and ability to give to the relationship in exchange for instant or foreseeable intrinsic value in the relationship. In this case, social currency proved to be a social system that acted as the social operating agent between the
dyad partners; a most revealing finding and contribution of this research. Examples of social currency included a willingness and ability to share, help, compromise, self-disclose, collaborate, and sympathize. Without the social currency, the dyads may not have been able to pass successfully through other components of the cultivation process or arrive at *friendship* status. For example, without the willingness and ability to be vulnerable and open, the dyads may not have successfully acquired the trust levels needed to tolerate and bridge racial and social differences between them. This aspect of social capital formation accounts for the dyads confidence that they could pick up the phone any time and know their partner would respond. This form of social capital is activated through features of social currency that exerts the willingness and ability to support and reciprocate.

A most significant aspect of the finding identifies social currency to be the *social agent* of social capital. The implication is that social currency may be the social agent for Lin’s (2001) four elements used to explain why social capital works in instrumental and expressive actions not accounted for by forms of personal capital such as economic or human capital. The four elements include: (a) flow of information and resources, (b) influence on decision-making, (c) social credentials and connections, and (d) reinforcement of identity and recognition. The implication of this finding suggests that social currency may be the social agent causing Lin’s four elements to be facilitated when social capital is at play.

*Navigating bridge networks and extended relationships across social domains.* During this aspect of friendship development, dyad members became free to expand their relationship beyond the dyad and started interacting across their networks within several
social domains such as family, work, business, spiritual, and entertainment. In some cases, dyads explored operating across multiple social domains while others stabilized within a single domain depending on their comfort level and social objectives. The research showed that those dyads that explored multiple social domains more often intensified their *intimacy and bonding* levels. As the dyads successfully interacted with members of each other’s network, they achieved greater cross-race exposure and experiences they shared together. These experiences tended to heighten the relationships to new levels of bonding and intimacy.

*Heightened social bonds and intimacy.* The final social system captures the network expansion process that includes: (a) creating and navigating interracial networks and extended dyad relationships and (b) heightened levels of friendship, social bonding, trust, and intimacy. Bridging interracial networks between the partners successfully heightened their relationship from friendship to *close friendship* or *spiritual-partner* status as described by dyad participants. The findings indicated that the stronger and more heightened the friendship, the greater the flow of social outcomes the partners were able to produce.

*Related social outcomes.* The friendship cultivated between the dyad network and expanded networks shared between them resulted in beneficial outcomes for both dyad members and society. The *social currency* and *friendship*, forms of social capital, cultivated between the partners served as a catalyst for applying their newly formed social capital towards initiating and producing social value and related outcomes. The outcomes, or the primary indicators, that emerged from the data included: (a) access to people, information, and resources; (b) interracial sensitivity, competence, and
confidence; (c) bridging networks; and (d) social bonding. The creation of dyad friendships and bridge networks emerged as both a process and a related social outcome. The same is true regarding the creation of bridge networks that were formed by the dyads.

Emerging Social Capital Formation Models

*The Interracial Social Capital Process Model*

The study resulted in the emergence of two models that illuminate the primary themes of this research. The first model entitled, *Interracial Social Capital Formation*, is shown in Figure 5.1. This model captures the emerging cognitive and structural social systems that resulted from the dyad’s engagements and collaborative efforts. The four social components associated with cultivating interracial dyadic friendships include: a) overcoming social and interracial contact barriers, b) engaging in face-to-face contact, c) making social connections, and d) creating and navigating interracial network expansion. Below this area are the two social systems associated with integrating new members into the dyad network that includes: a) navigating network expansion, and b) heightened bonding and intimacy. This network expansion is linked to the friendship cultivation process by the two bars shown in the model.

The outer circle in this model shows that the components of the social system are interactive and ongoing, which are neither linear nor static. This outer circle also represents the transient nature of the relationship development process. For example, as the partner’s relationship developed, if something happened to violate the trust between the partners, they are at liberty to recycle through any one of the four social system components.
Embedded in the center of the model are the social outcomes that emerged as a result of the social capital formed between the dyads and their expanded network members that included: a) friendship, b) access, c) interracial sensitivity and competence, and d) forms of human, financial, and symbolic capital. The social outcomes are distinguished between cognitive and structural forms of outcomes. They are located at the
center of the model because the dyad members were at liberty to produce outcomes from either the dyad network or the expanded dyad network and at any time.

Interracial Friendship Cultivation Process

The second model that emerged from the research is represented in the form of a diagram and is entitled, *Interracial Social Capital Formation Process Diagram*, shown in Figure 5.2. It illuminates the five levels of developmental stages involved in the interracial friendship cultivation process. The five emerging stages of dyad relationship development include: (a) stranger or casual acquaintance, (b) friendship cultivation, (c) navigating and expanding the dyad network, and (f) heightened level friendship. The diagram starts with dyad participants *A* and *B* depicted as separate circles that are not connected to show the *stranger* relationship (*Level 1*), shown in Figure 5.2. The friendship cultivation process starts when the dyads are introduced and begin to interact (*Level 2*) and is shown with a line connecting *A* and *B*. This involves the dyad relationship as they encounter three of the social system components shown in boxes with arrows that include: (a) overcoming social contact barriers, (b) initiating and sustaining contact engagements, and (c) making social connections. During this stage, the dyads spent time together engaged in dialogue and self-disclosure sharing their feelings, thoughts, and personal experiences, which led to the development of social currency and trust. This stage of the process helped to expose commonalities and differences and nurture understandings that bridged the differences and built trust. Once trust and social currency were established, friendship was formed and is shown in the *Diagram at Level 3*. 
Figure 5.2:

*Interracial Social Capital Formation Process Diagram*

Cultivating Interracial Social Capital and Related Social Outcomes
While the formation of social capital included building trust, it also included the cultivation of other bonding agents that are not generally associated with social capital. These bonding agents that emerged from the data included such as the act of caring, sharing, and helping, which developed deeper levels of commitment and bonding in the relationship. Once social currency between the dyads was formed, the dyads moved to an advanced level in their relationship to that of friendship, shown in Figure 5.2, and is represented by the two conjoining circles; A and B. Social currency was the most revealing aspect of the social capital formation process. Very little research has been done at this micro level of social capital formation to reveal its contribution to the social capital formation process. The social outcomes produced at Level 3 only transpired after social currency existed in the relationship and is represented below the conjoined circles.

*Level 4* represents the outreach collaborated by the dyads to integrate new members into their dyad network. Social outcomes resulting from expanding their network to include members from each of their social networks are represented at levels 4 and 5 in the Diagram. For example, the diagram shows at Level 4 that dyad member A has invited one member into the dyad network, and dyad member B has invited two members into the dyad network. Successful navigation of network expansion led to *Level 5*, a heightened state of friendship.

**Significance of the Findings**

Only a few qualitative studies exist on social capital that have an orientation to indices measurement and have been conducted largely from the context of education and based on studies of student populations that correspond to dorm room arrangements and academic school years (Hallinan & Teixeira, 1987; Shelton et al., 2005). A plethora of
quantitative studies exist that have investigated external social capital variables and indices (Goddard, 2003) that might collectively affect student achievement or perceptions, crime and trust rates, and the development of rural communities (Frank F. Furstenberg & Hughes, 2008; Grootaert et al., 2004; Putnam, 2000). A great deal of qualitative research also exists on social capital studied from surveys collected at the macro community level and on external variables developed by Putnam’s (2002) benchmark study (Saguaro Seminar, 2000). Other studies were focused on commercial relationships that are short term in nature and have very specific, outcome goals such as engaging in business transactions.

There is a void of studies on social capital at the individual level. Examination at the micro-level enables meaning around the how of social capital particularly around how it was created and formed (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995). For this reason, this phenomenological study adds to the body of empirical research on social capital specifically at the individual micro level, which includes individuals and small dyadic networks. The void makes this research study a valuable source of unique findings that may contribute to corporations, community and social service organizations, and community race relations, as well as civic intervention and community outreach.

Another unique aspect of the study is that it is a phenomenological qualitative investigation on interracial social capital formation based on the cross-race dyad relations of executive business and community leaders. In addition to examining the formation of social capital, the study also examines the social outcomes that are a direct result of interracial social capital formation among corporate and community leaders.
While this is not a longitudinal study, it does address interracial dyad social capital formation that evolved between the dyads over an eight-year period. Most qualitative studies focus on much shorter spans of time and typically less than one year. This study initially intended to examine results within the one-year period of the intervention program; however, because the dyads had difficulty distinguishing the timing of their shared experiences beyond the first few months of their interactions, the data reflected the *lived experience* spanning eight years. According to Coleman (1990), it takes time to form social capital and to produce social outcomes, which makes the eight-year reflection time a richer source of information that would otherwise have been missed had the participants been confined to sharing just within the one-year period of the structured program. The eight-year reflection period provided dyads a deeper capacity to unfold meaning in the relationship and capture the fulfillment of completed social outcomes. Both offered an opportunity to encompass the natural evolution of intergroup contact relationships over a wider period. The fact that the dyads maintained their friendship relationship beyond the one-year program provides significant and rich data on the nature of the contact, the social capital formation process, and the potential for interracial relationships. This type of data is virtually non-existent in the field of social capital across races (Pettigrew, 1998).

This study also expands upon the knowledge on intergroup and interracial contact because it focuses on specific interracial interactions shared by dyad members who participated in a racial opportunity network intervention program. The structured intervention program provided a support structure to generate the contact opportunities
for cultivating interracial friendships across races that enables other forms of social capital to develop consistent with Blau’s (1977) opportunity network theory.

This study contributes to the knowledge base on interracial contact and social capital formation across races. For example, the study findings showed creating opportunities for cross-racial friendship formation is one strategy that can lead to significant reductions in levels of social distance between people who are different. The research findings of this study can be applied within the field of education, business, and community organizations. Additionally, this study showed that interracial social capital formation leads to other forms of social capital such as human, economic, and symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1983; Coleman, 1988; Lin, 2001), which makes this study relevant to community economic development and human resource management. For example, there is a continued need to mobilize economic and human capital resources among African-American and Latino communities where social capital is found to be low (Saguaro Seminar, 2000). The literature suggests and the research findings demonstrate that social capital transfers (Lin, 2001) into other forms of capital. Based on the findings of this research, once social capital is formed through the relationships development process, social capital can be transformed into symbolic, human, and economic forms of capital as outcomes of interracial social capital. Without the interracial social capital formation process, these other forms of capital may be difficult to achieve.

Findings from this study revealed that the resources embedded in interracial social relationships are multi-dimensional and dynamic in nature and that constructing the cognitive and structural systems may be needed to form interracial social capital. This finding is consistent with Grootaert and Baastelaer (2002) who suggests that structural
social capital facilitates information sharing and collective action and decision making while cognitive social capital refers to shared norms, values, trust, and beliefs. Both cognitive and structural forms of social capital were needed to produce the social outcomes in this study. It also revealed the interactive engagement between structural and cognitive forms of social capital. This is significant as consideration might be given to developing structural enterprises around both cognitive and structural components to effectively produce interracial social capital and related outcomes. Examples of such enterprises include establishing networks, such as a racial opportunity network and ways to overcome cognitive racial barriers to more fully engage; for example, the issues of economic development within depressed communities.

Another significant aspect of this research is the distinction between the formation process and process outcomes. These distinctions are important considerations for future program development and implementation. The same is true regarding the creation of bridge networks. The significance of this process is that it is a byproduct of maintaining and expanding interracial friendship. These two social capital formation processes were found to be significant factors to building interracial social capital and were the catalyst for producing social outcomes. The research also showed that both phases of the social capital formation process resulted in social outcomes, which represents a potential area for exploring and developing new ways to improve build and enhance race relations.

Based on the results of this study, interracial friendships can be linked to quantifiable measures of social outcomes that provide both individual and social value. It is possible that such outcomes may provide a predictable and measurable component to interracial friendships. The number of interracial friendships found within a given
society, for example, is a potential useful indicator of interracial social outcomes that provide value to society across races. This research identified both direct and indirect social outcomes produced by the dyads. While individual or direct social outcomes were easier to trace, it was more difficult to measure indirect outcomes of social value beyond two or three degrees of separation. These types of outcomes and measures may be useful, particularly for understanding and serving the needs of demographically changing and rapidly growing diverse communities.

As mentioned earlier, Allport’s (1955/1979) Intergroup Contact Hypothesis suggests that interracial group contact should have a positive effect in reducing prejudice and racial polarization under four conditions. The positive-sum outcomes that resulted from these business and community leader pairings was also demonstrated Allport’s (1955/1979) equal-status condition for prejudice reduction optimization. In fact, the participants experienced all four of Allport’s conditions and program design accounted for all five conditions: cooperation among the groups, a common goal, equal status, support of authority, and friendship potential. Each of the conditions was present for the dyads.

Based on the findings of this study, the dyad’s experienced greater interracial sensitivity, enhanced cultural competencies, and increased self-confidence in cross-race matters. This research also reached across five distinct dimensions of cross race relations: (a) cultivating friendships; (b) social capital formation; (c) intergroup contact; (d) cognitive and structural systems; and (e) interracial social outcomes. Using the phenomenological qualitative study approach allowed these findings to emerge and allowed the how of prejudice reduction and racial polarization to emerge. This study was
able to capture an eight-year dyad history, which makes this research a unique contribution to social capital, intergroup contact, multi-cultural, and interracial social relations theories (Odell et al., 2005; Segura et al., 2001).

The emerging process for social capital formation resulting from this study revealed how interracial dyads went about transforming a casual acquaintance to one of friendship, which, in keeping with Grootaert and Bastelaer (2002), also proved to be an outcome of social capital. In addition to the emerging interracial friendship theme, this study also revealed an interracial social relations process, which resulted in social capital outcomes framed around the process for social capital formation. Today, there are very few, if any, qualitative studies that have resulted in this level of qualitative investigation on the outcomes of interracial social capital formation over an extended time (Pettigrew, 1998).

Limitations

The research has several limitations. First, purposive sampling was used to indentify a select group of participants. The sample size consisted only of dyads that were known to have formed social capital. For this reason, the study is limited to findings of this group selection. The participants of this sample represented only one Cohort, which was the first year of the intervention. Relationships developed between the dyads may differ by the timing of the implementation of the intervention, leaders who participated, and the magnitude and scope of the leader’s influence who participated in the program.

Recommendation for Future Research

Review of the literature and results of the study suggest a need for further research. This study excluded dyads that did not form social capital or complete the
program. Comparing the results of the purposeful sample to less successful cases of social capital formation could offer additional insights to the current findings. This study included executive leadership on at the highest level of management. The research did not explore interracial social capital formation from lower levels of leadership and management, which could also provide additional insight to this study.

Since all the participants of this study formed friendships, further study on those participants who did not form friendships may reveal the extent to which *friendship*, as a process of interracial social capital formation, is a required factor in producing interracial social outcomes. In other words, is it possible to form social capital and produce positive-sum outcomes without achieving *friendship* status? Future research on this study would be to conduct a similar study on a purposeful sampling of the dyads that were not successful at forming friendships beyond the formal, one-year program, as well as those dyads that performed at marginal levels of social capital development. For example, some dyads created friendships while only meeting at coffee shops but did not expand their network base, exchange networks, or demonstrate reciprocity.

Applying the results of unsuccessful dyads to the existing results would allow for the present research to compare and contrast factors associated with or contributing to high and low levels of social capital formation. These studies might also be compared to both the *Interracial Social Capital Formation Model* as well as the *Interracial Social Capital Formation Process Diagram* to determine how these groups performed compared to executive leaders. For example, how did dyads unsuccessful at forming social capital compare with the executive leader results, and which steps were achieved or not achieved, and how might this enlighten the empirical knowledge of this study? Another
future study might be to examine the difference between executive leaders and middle managers. Over the five-year period, the Prism Program reached out to middle managers. It would be interesting to compare these findings with those at the executive level of leadership.

More research is necessary to explore using interracial social outcomes as a measure. Accumulating data in this area is necessary to accurately project anticipated outcomes of interracial friendships. If this measurement theory stands up, more data will also be needed to accurately project anticipated outcomes. Projections of this nature may be based on the social roles and economic status of the dyad members. For example, this study revealed the social outcomes resulting solely from executive business and community leaders who engaged in forming interracial friendships. Research is needed to determine the outcomes of other potential groups such as middle managers and individual contributors.

This study examined the lived experiences of eight participants and four dyads. Future study might be to add to this database to explore the generalizability aspect of the study. Also, future studies may compare different cohort years to determine possible affects of changes to the program as well as possible environmental factors that might alter or affect changes in results. Further research could explore the value of the coaching and training aspects of the program both in terms of their contribution to the friendship as well as cultural competency and social outcomes.

While this study was not intended to evaluate the intervention program, a few areas of discussion are appropriate given the dyads were bound by its influence. Future studies could be conducted on the social aids used during the program and the influence
these aids had on supporting the dyads in formation of social capital. The program included aids such as: diversity coaching, cluster meetings, paired matching, and printed resources.

The program’s foundation appeared to meet Allport’s (1955/1979) optimal conditions for reducing prejudice and Pettigrew’s (Pettigrew, 1997) added condition for optimizing -- friendships potential. A closer examination of this might enhance future intervention endeavors.

The findings indicated that the interview process helped the partners discover their experience more clearly. Based on this finding, the program might benefit from a debriefing as a valuable component of the program following the year-long experience.

Corporate, community, and civic policies may require employees and departments to participate in similar programs to support the development of interracial and cultural competencies. Success stories about these informants should be publicized in an attempt to get more potential participants in the community for making it a better place to live. Other cities might be encouraged to replicate such programs and, thus, start to make America a better country that will be more prepared to deal with the changing racial demographics of the population. One recommendation for the program is to consider expanding the program offerings beyond the one-year period in some capacity. Based on the findings, friendships are a long-term endeavor and may require continued structural and cognitive support to achieve the community’s social and economic goals.

Summary and Conclusion

This study contributes to our understanding of how to increase social capital across racial ethnic diverse lines, which can further the goal of turning the nation’s
diversity into a national asset. Interracial social capital formation in this study is analyzed from the context of the leader’s participation in a structured racial intervention program designed to reduce racial polarization and build trust across races in Warfield, a community that suffers one of the higher child poverty rates in the U.S.

The dyads were selected employing purposeful sampling of matched pairings that participated in the program and demonstrated an ability to form social capital by developing interracial friendships and producing social capital outcomes. This study included four matched interracial pairings who did not know each other prior to the program and since maintained relationships that spanned eight years (2001-2009). The data were derived from four interracial partner dyads, 20 interviews including two individual and four dyad, field notes, document collections, and researcher memos. Each dyad was analyzed and then compared across all dyads to reveal emerging themes presented as study findings in this chapter. The data revealed both a process of interracial social capital formation and specific related outcomes. Further study is recommended to compare dyads that experience less successful social capital formation results to the current findings.
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Dear ____________________________

I am a doctoral student at St. John Fisher College Executive Leadership Development conducting research in support of my dissertation work. I am interested in studying the successful interracial working relationships of the Mosaic Partnership program with the goal of presenting positive models to schools and other institutions face with addressing issues of building social capital in less privileged communities.

To participate in the program we are looking to schedule three ninety-minute interview sessions within a three-week period. The first two interviews will be individual interviews with the dyad members. The final interview will be both members of the dyads participating in the interview process together.

The results of our discussions will be used along with discussions I have with others to write my dissertation, the contents of which may eventually be published as articles or books. Your name will be confidential and your information will not identified with the information.

I will take notes and write up my observations after each interview and will share my analysis with you to be sure that your thoughts are accurately represented. You are welcome to correct or expand upon any information at any time. You are also welcome to discontinue at any point during the data collection process.

Please complete the interview consent form and the demographic information sheet if you decide to participate in the interview process.

Sincerely,

Melody Cofield, M.B.A.
APPENDIX B

Interview Consent Form

This consent form outlines my rights as a participant in the study of social capital formation conducted by Melody A. Cofield, St. John Fisher College, Doctoral Program in Executive Leadership, Rochester, NY 14608.

The interview will explore your experiences with the Mosaic Partnership program, particularly as it relates to the relationship between you and your partner.

It will take about 90 minutes for each of three interviews spread out over a six-week period.

I understand that

1. Taking part in this study is entirely voluntary.
2. It is my right to decline to answer any question that I am asked.
3. I am free to end the interview at any time.
4. I may request that the interview not be taped.
5. My name and identity will remain confidential in any publications or discussions.
6. My name will not appear on any tapes or transcripts resulting from the interview.

I HAVE READ THIS CONSENT FORM. I HAVE HAD A CHANCE TO ASK QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AREAS THAT I DID NOT UNDERSTAND.

_________________________________________
(Signature of Interviewee)

_________________________________________
(Printed name of Interviewee)

____________________
(Date)

You may decline to participate in this study. You may end your participation in this study at any time. Maintaining your anonymity is a priority and every practical precaution will be taken to disguise your identity. There will not be any identifying information on audiotapes or transcripts of this interview. I will not allow anyone other than the research advisor to hear any audiotape of your voice or review a transcript of this interview. All
materials generated from your interview (e.g., audiotapes and transcripts) will remain in my direct physical possession.

________________________________________________
(Signature of Interviewer and Date)
APPENDIX C

Demographic Information Form

Name  __________________________________________________________________
Address  ________________________________________________________________
Telephone  ______________________________________________________________
Email  __________________________________________________________________
Race/Ethnicity:  __________________________________
Age ___________________   Marital status  :  Single ____ Married ____ Divorced ___
Male _____ Female _____
Education:  High School _____ College _____ Post Grad_______
Occupation  ______________________________________________________________

Please list any community service projects/organization you are involved in.

________________________________________________________

Please check each sector that applies to your professional endeavors:

___ Education   ___ Manufacturing   ___ Hospitality
___ Health care   ___ Media   ___ Transportation
___ Finance   ___ Marketing   ___ Utilities
___ Banking   ___ Foundations   ___ Technology
___ Consumer Goods   ___ Business Services   ___ Arts
___ Consumer Services

Please check all of the sectors that apply to you or that you are involved in.


What was your partner’s name?
First Name ______________________________ Last Name ______________________

1. How often did you meet with your partner after the Prism Program?

    Approximately Number of Months _____  Number of Years _____
2. Are you still in contact with your partner? Yes ___ No___
3. If yes to number 2 above, approximately how often did you meet after the program?
   Screening Questions
   Wkly __ Monthly__ Quarterly ____
   Annually_____
4. Did you know or had you ever met your partner before the program? Yes ___ No___
5. Do you maintain contact with your partner after the program? Yes ___ No___
6. Are you currently meeting with your partner on a regular basis? Yes ___ No____
7. Did you and your partner engage in a project together? Yes___ No ____
8. Did you or your partner share networks with each other? Yes__ No__
9. If yes to 9 above, which types did you share together?
   Personal __ Family __ Work __ Neighbors___
10. How would you describe your predisposition to participating in the program initially?
    Very __ Somewhat__ Not at all ___

IMPORTANT:
Are you willing to be interviewed with your partner? Yes___ No _____

Are you willing to schedule two (2) 90-minute individual interviews, and one (1) 90-minute interview together with your partner no more than two weeks apart? Yes__ No __

What is the best time for the interviews? Morning__ Afternoon ___Eve ___Weekends __
Are you willing to be taped? Yes___ No _____
APPENDIX D

Interview 1

*Pre-Program Perspective:* Objective: (a) to build rapport with interviewee, (b) set the stage and (c) to learn as much as possible about the participant; (d) reconstruct their early experiences in their families, in school, with friends, in the neighborhood, and at work, and; (e) Understand attitudes, preconceived notions, and behaviors prior to the program.

1. Please tell me about your experience growing up, professional development, family and friendships that share how racial ethnic diversity, or lack of diversity, was an influence in your life.
   Probes:
   a. What were the operating views on race like in the environment?
   b. What has been your experience, if any, working with people of a difference ethnicity than yours?

2. What led to your participation in the Prism Program?
   Probes:
   a. What was your experience with structured diversity programs and training before the Prism, if any?
   b. When you were invited to participate in the Prism program, what were your expectations or concerns, if any?
   c. What perspective did you have about interracial friendships prior to the program?

3. What did you learn about yourself from your experience with your partner?
   Probes:
   a. How have you changed, if at all?
APPENDIX E

Interview 2

Relationship experience during and after the Mosaic Partnership program: (a) To build rapport with interviewee, (b) set the stage and (c) reconstruct the details of the formation of their relationship and other network relationships established together.

1. Describe how your relationship with your partner evolved over the course of the program year.
   a. What were the benefits of the relationships, if any?
   b. What kept the relationship going after the Mosaic Program ended?

2. Describe how personal and/or professional activities, information sharing, and networking, if any, took place?

3. How is your relationship with your partner different, or the same, as compared to your typical friends?

4. How did you, your partner, and others benefit personally or professionally from the relationship with your partner?

5. Describe how you and your partner work together and with others on personal, professional, or community endeavor and activities, if at all?
APPENDIX F

Interview 3

Interview with both partners together: (a) to reflect on the meaning of their personal and shared experience (intellectual and emotional connections between the participants); (b) Share and explore a theme from each participant developed from the individual interview sessions and openly discuss each participant’s views on the theme.

1. Introduce major theme from each of the personal interviews. Ask each partner, “What is your response to this?”

2. What was most beneficial about your partnership?

3. Describe actions or decisions taken by you and/or your partner supported relationship?

4. The program had a vision to reduce racial polarity, was this something you both were committed to help happen, and how did you each go about supporting this goal? If so, how were you able to support this goal?

5. How has your relationship influenced you and others in your life?

6. What advice would you offer to others in the area of having and developing ethnically diverse friendships?